

09:08:02

OCA PAD AMENDMENT - PROJECT HEADER INFORMATION

01/25/90

Active

Project #: E-19-644  
Center # : R6664-0A0

Cost share #:  
Center shr #:

Rev #: 2  
OCA file #: 131  
Work type : RES  
Document : CONT  
Contract entity: GTRC

Contract#: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004  
Prime #:

Mod #: 02

Subprojects ? : Y  
Main project #:

Project unit: CHE  
Project director(s):  
SOMMERFELD J T CHE

Unit code: 02.010.114  
(404)894-2873

Sponsor/division names: US DEPT OF DEFENSE  
Sponsor/division codes: 101

/ DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGY  
/ 008

Award period: 881220 to 900331 (performance) 900630 (reports)

Sponsor amount	New this change	Total to date
Contract value	0.00	147,376.00
Funded	0.00	147,376.00
Cost sharing amount		0.00

Does subcontracting plan apply ? : Y

Title: DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION APPLIED TO APPAREL MANUFACTURING

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION DATA

OCA contact: Don S. Hasty 894-4820

Sponsor technical contact

Sponsor issuing office

MR. DANIEL V. GEARING/DPMSO  
(202)274-6445  
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY  
CAMERON STATION  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304-6100


MS. KAREN COLWELL/DESC-PSC  
(513)296-5844  
DEFENSE ELECTRONICS SUPPLY CENTER  
1507 WILMINGTON PIKE  
DAYTON, OH 45444-5208

Security class (U,C,S,TS) : U  
Defense priority rating : DO-C9  
Equipment title vests with: Sponsor X

ONR resident rep. is ACO (Y/N): Y  
GOVT supplemental sheet  
GIT

Administrative comments -

MOD. 02 EXTENDS PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE THROUGH 3/31/90. DELIVERABLE SCHEDULE  
ADJUSTED TO REFLECT SEVERAL CHANGES RECEIVED AGAINST THE BASIC CONTRACT.



GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PROJECT CLOSEOUT

Closeout Notice Date 03/13/91

Project No. E-19-644 \_\_\_\_\_ Center No. R6664-OA0 \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Director SOMMERFELD J T \_\_\_\_\_ School/Lab CHEM ENGR \_\_\_\_\_  
Sponsor US DEPT OF DEFENSE/DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGY \_\_\_\_\_  
Contract/Grant No. DLA900-87-D-0018-0004 \_\_\_\_\_ Contract Entity GTRC  
Prime Contract No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Title DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION APPLIED TO APPAREL MANUFACTURING \_\_\_\_\_  
Effective Completion Date 900331 (Performance) 900630 (Reports)

Closeout Actions Required:	Y/N	Date Submitted
Final Invoice or Copy of Final Invoice	Y	_____
Final Report of Inventions and/or Subcontracts	Y	_____
Government Property Inventory & Related Certificate	Y	_____
Classified Material Certificate	N	_____
Release and Assignment	Y	_____
Other _____	N	_____
Comments _____		

Subproject Under Main Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

Continues Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

Distribution Required:

Project Director	Y
Administrative Network Representative	Y
GTRI Accounting/Grants and Contracts	Y
Procurement/Supply Services	Y
Research Property Management	Y
Research Security Services	N
Reports Coordinator (OCA)	Y
GTRC	Y
Project File	Y
Other _____	N
_____	N

NOTE: Final Patent Questionnaire sent to PDPI.

## NOTICE OF PROJECT CLOSEOUT (SUBPROJECTS)

Project No. E-19-644 Center No. R6664-0A0 \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Director SOMMERFELD J T \_\_\_\_\_ School/Lab CHEM ENGR \_\_\_\_\_  
Sponsor US DEPT OF DEFENSE/DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGY \_\_\_\_\_

Project # A-8272	PD ADAMS J C JR	Unit 01.021.270	T
CONT # DLA900-87-D-0018-000	MOD#	NOTE OF 9/19/90	EDL *
Ctr # R6664-000	Main proj # E-19-644	OCA CO	DSH
Sponsor-US DEPT OF DEFENSE	/DEFENSE LOGISTICS AG		101/008
DISCRETE EVENT SIMUL			
Start 881220	End 900331	Funded 47,654.00	Contract 47,654.00

Project #	E-27-640	PD	TINCHER W C	Unit	02.010.130	T
CONT #	DLA900-87-D-0018-000	MOD#	BUD REV	900816	TEXT ENGR	*
Ctr #	R6664-0A1	Main proj #	E-19-644	OCA CO	DSH	
Sponsor-US	DEPT OF DEFENSE	/DEFENSE	LOGISTICS AG		101/008	
DISCRETE EVENT SIMUL						
Start	881220	End	900331	Funded	56,034.94	Contract
					56,034.94	

1. \* indicates the project is a subproject.
2. I indicates the project is active and being updated.
3. A indicates the project is currently active.
4. T indicates the project has been terminated.
5. R indicates a terminated project that is being modified.



March 14, 1989

Ms. Sara Williams  
Defense Electronics Supply Center  
CO  
ATTN: PSC  
1507 Wilmington Pike  
Dayton, Ohio 45444-5208

**SUBJECT: Program Schedules/Technical Reports/  
Contract No. DLA900-87-D-0018 Short Term Research Projects  
Performance Period: 890201 - 890228**

Dear Ms. Williams:

Please find the captioned reports attached for your review.

Sincerely,

Susan Griffin  
Associate Director  
AMTC

Attachments

cc: John Adams, PO  
Dan Gearing, COTR

**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY  
APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER  
DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION**

**DLA900-87-0018-0004  
(E-19-644)**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890201 - 890228**

Submitted By:

Susan Griffin

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

March 15, 1989

Sponsored By:

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Defense Logistics Agency position, policy, or documentation.

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **February Activities**

A progress report was presented at AMTC's Annual Contract Briefing.

Software and documentation for the General Purpose Discrete Event Simulation (GPSS) for the IBM PS/2 computer has been received from Minuteman Software. The software and hardware security system have been installed on a PS/2 Model 50 computer in the School of Textile Engineering. Initial testing of the software revealed only one minor compatibility problem which will be corrected.

A model of a trouser manufacturing facility designed to produce 4,000 pairs per day has been developed. The model includes alternate manufacturing schemes for different levels of automated assembly. This model will serve as the basis for the simulation.

A student from the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering has been employed to conduct the programming of the model.

Work has been initiated on the back pocket and back panel segment of trouser manufacturing simulation.

### **Plans for March**

Continue programming and preliminary model development efforts.

Researchers plan a visit to Coastal Manufacturing Company to discuss model development.

**PROGRAM SCHEDULE**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**  
**SHORT TERM RESEARCH PROJECT**  
**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890201 - 890228**

Submitted By:

Susan Griffin

**Economic Development Laboratory**  
**Georgia Tech Research Institute**  
**Georgia Institute of Technology**

March 15, 1989

Sponsored By:

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**  
**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Defense Logistics Agency position, policy, or documentation.

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1												2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑		↑													
Validation of model						↑			↑		↑													
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION

## PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 020189 - 022889



**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**  
**DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION**

**DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**  
**(E-19-644)**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890301 - 890331**

Submitted By:

Susan Griffin

**Economic Development Laboratory**  
**Georgia Tech Research Institute**  
**Georgia Institute of Technology**

April 15, 1989

Sponsored By:

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**  
**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Defense Logistics Agency position, policy, or documentation.

CLIN 0010

Contract Data Requirements List Item A001

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **March Activities**

The process flow diagram for the utility trouser manufacturing facility simulation has been modified to incorporate data obtained during the visit to Coastal Industries in Selma, Alabama. The visit and subsequent discussions with executives and plant managers were very useful in refining the model.

Coastal also agreed to share confidential manufacturing data to assist in evaluating the simulation.

North Carolina State has been collecting manufacturing data on jeans and agreed to share this information with AMTC.

Programming of the back panel segment of trouser manufacturing simulation continues.

### **Plans for April**

Continue to expand the data base on utility trouser manufacturing processes.

Begin standard manufacturing time determinations using selected computer based engineering time study programs.

Complete the trouser back panel assembly simulation.

**PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890301 - 890331**

Submitted By:

Susan Griffin

Economic Development Laboratory

Georgia Tech Research Institute

Georgia Institute of Technology

April 15, 1989

Sponsored By:

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Defense Logistics Agency position, policy, or documentation.

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection	↑	↑																						
(demonstration mill)																								
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation											↑	↑												
of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 030189 - 033189

**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**  
**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**  
**(E-19-644)**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890401 - 890430**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**May 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

**The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this  
report are those of the authors and should not be  
construed as an official Defense Logistics  
Agency position, policy, or documentation.**

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **April Activities**

The prototype discrete event simulation model has been constructed. This model is based on AMTC pilot plant and is designed for a production capacity of 4,800 pairs of utility trousers per day.

For model verification, production times for each step in the production process were based on balanced plant activities.

### **Plans for May**

The model will be evaluated using the test data supplied by Coastal Manufacturing.

Continue to collect standard production data for refinement of model.

Begin modification of the model to include production processes required when automated fly making equipment cannot be used.

**PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890401 - 890430**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**May 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑		↑													
Validation of model						↑			↑		↑													
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center										↑	↑	↑												
Documentation of results										↑	↑													

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 040189 - 043089



**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890501 - 890531**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**June 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **May Activities**

The GPSS prototype model of the AMTC plant has undergone continued evaluation this month. The model plant was designed for a production capacity of 4,800 pairs of utility trousers per day.

Table 1 lists the operations on the critical path of this facility. Beginning with the operations of spreading, cutting, and bundling, the critical path then proceeds to the subassembly of flies and fronts. The critical path then traverses through the various finishing and final assembly operations. All other operations (e.g. subassembly of back pockets and backs) are not on the critical path for this facility.

The waiting (or queueing) statistics for the various matching operations in this facility are summarized in Table 2. Specifically shown are the average waiting time (in minutes per pair of trousers) and queue length (number of identical items for one pair of trousers) for each subassembly waiting for downstream processing. In general, the corresponding subassembly operations for each of these waiting items are not on the critical path for the facility.

### **Plans for June**

Data on manufacturing times from Coastal Industries has been processed and is ready to enter in the model next month.

North Carolina State University has compiled data on standard jean manufacturing operations which are comparable to the military utility trouser. AMTC researchers have requested access to this information.

TABLE 1

## OPERATIONS ON THE CRITICAL PATH

<u>STEP NO.</u>	<u>OPERATION</u>
5	Spreading, cutting, bundling
6	Make left fly
7	Make right fly
	Join flies
	Match fr panels, pockets, flies
13	Attach front pockets
14	Attach left fly
15	Topstitch left fly
16	Join fronts
	Match fronts, backs, bands
	Finishing operations

TABLE 2

## QUEUEING STATISTICS FOR VARIOUS MATCHING OPERATIONS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Matching Operation</u>	<u>Waiting Time</u>	<u>Queue Length</u>
Back panels	Back panels and back pockets	0.30	3
Front panels	Front panels, pockets and flies	0.70	7
Front pockets	Front panels, pockets and flies	0.50	5
Waist bands	Fronts, backs, bands and loops	2.80	29
Belt loops	Fronts, backs, bands and loops	2.70	28
Backs	Fronts, backs, bands and loops	0.10	1

**PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890501 - 890531**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**June 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Unclassified Distribution Unlimited	
5. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) DLA900-87-D-0018-0004 #7			
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Georgia Tech Research Institute	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Dan Gearing, COTR Defense Logistics Agency	
7. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 215 O'Keefe Building Atlanta, GA 30332		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ATTN: DPMSO Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6100	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Defense Logistic Agency	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) DPMSO	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
10. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6100		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 78011S	PROJECT NO.
		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION APPLIED TO APPAREL MANUFACTURING			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Interim	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 6-1-89 TO 6-30-89	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 7-15-89	15. PAGE COUNT
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			

7. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Simulation, discrete simulation, modelling, operations research, queueing theory, GPSS-PC
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	
12	05		
12	04		
9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			

The objective of this project is to develop a validated simulation of a trouser manufacturing plant to serve as a tool for evaluating new technology and manufacturing methods. This GPSS model includes all major machine operations in a trouser plant. This model will help determine the effects of market demands, QC policies, maintenance practices, etc. on equipment and labor utilization, WIP, and total production time.

This report documents monthly progress on model development and outlines plans for the next period.

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Susan C. Griffin		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (-04) 894-6113	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**  
**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**  
**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890601 - 890630**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**July 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**  
**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **June Activities**

GPSS was used to model a full-scale facility currently manufacturing men's utility trousers. This model represents a facility using traditional equipment and methods to manufacture the trousers and will be very useful for comparison with the AMTC facility using advanced equipment. The initial model was intentionally unbalanced to observe the response of the model under this condition. Response was essentially as expected, thus providing an additional verification.

Discussions were held with Ms. Carole Carrere of N.C. State University concerning access to the data base being developed there. A list of operations common to military trouser manufacturing and other jeans manufacturing has been developed and will be used to obtain data for the GPSS model.

### **Plans for July**

Model of the full-scale production plant will be balanced and the operation and queuing statistics generated.

Standard production times for AMTC operations will be determined using commercial software packages.

A visit to N.C. State is planned to discuss the nature of the data base and conditions of access.



# **PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

## **APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890601 - 890630**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**July 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1												2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION  
PROGRAM SCHEDULE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Unclassified Distribution Unlimited		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)  DHA 900 87-D-0018-0004 #9			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Georgia Tech Research Institute		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Dan Gearing, COTR Defense Logistics Agency		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 215 O'Keefe Building Atlanta, GA 30332			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ATTN: DPMSO Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6100		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Defense Logistic Agency		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) DPMSO	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6100			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 78011S	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.
			WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.		
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION APPLIED TO APPAREL MANUFACTURING					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Interim		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 7-1-89 TO 7-5-89		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 890815	
15. PAGE COUNT					
6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
7. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
12	05		Simulation, discrete simulation, modelling, operations		
12	04		research, queueing theory, GPSS-PC		
9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
<p>This project is aimed at developing an expert system to identify sources of various types of defects (e.g. fabric, sewing) and the remedies for minimizing them. Researchers are developing the criteria and rules for classifying and preventing defects. Another goal is to access the economic impact of defects in apparel manufacturing, such as lost sales due to second quality garments and lost production time due to reworking.</p> <p>This report documents monthly progress for developing knowledge base software and user documentation materials.</p>					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Susan C. Griffin			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (-24) 894-6113		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**  
**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**  
**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890701 - 890731**

Submitted By:

Susan Griffin

Economic Development Laboratory

Georgia Tech Research Institute

Georgia Institute of Technology

August 15, 1989

Sponsored By:

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Defense Logistics Agency position, policy, or documentation.

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **July Activities**

The discrete-event simulation (with GPSS) of an industrial utility trousers manufacturing plant (Coastal Industries in Selma, Alabama) has been completed. This simulation work has validated the applicability of GPSS to the modeling of an apparel manufacturing operation, specifically trousers. Key output results from this model are in agreement with actual plant data. Thus, at a production level of 40,000 pairs of trousers per week, there are about 77,000 pairs (or almost two weeks of production) in stages (work-in-process or WIP inventory). Also, this level of production requires approximately 250 work stations (employees and/or machines).

The greatest difficulties encountered in modeling this facility relate to its size. Commercial GPSS software packages for industrial simulation can have a maximum of approximately 1500 transactions resident in the model at any one time. Thus, it became necessary to define a single GPSS transaction as representing 160 pairs of trousers. This value corresponds to the average number of plies cut in one spreading and cutting operation at the subject mill, as opposed to the nominal bundle size of 40 pairs. With this latter transaction size, steady-state operation could not be achieved before computer memory was exhausted. Even with the larger transaction size of 160 pairs or 4 bundles, the model must be reasonably balanced, e.g., not overfed, in order to achieve steady-state convergence (as is also the case in the real-world operation). This is because the model must be able to contain the various cut but unassembled parts, also represented by daughter transactions, in addition to nearly finished and assembled pairs.

### **Plans for August**

Detailed statistics on queuing times and utilizations of the various work stations will be compiled in a future report.

Having verified the applicability of discrete-event simulation to apparel manufacturing, we will now move on to the construction of a generic model (still employing GPSS) for simulation of a trousers manufacturing facility. The general flow configuration of this generic model will remain similar to that of the mill operation used for validation purposes. However, more general unit processing time from the North Carolina State University Apparel Manufacturing database will be incorporated, including means and standard deviation for Gaussian, or normal distribution of the various unit processing times. This stochastic feature will, per force, introduce some additional but realistic imbalance into the model.

**PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890701 - 890731**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**August 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

**TECHNICAL REPORT, MONTHLY**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890801 - 890831**

Submitted By:

Susan Griffin

Economic Development Laboratory

Georgia Tech Research Institute

Georgia Institute of Technology

September 15, 1989

Sponsored By:

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Defense Logistics Agency position, policy, or documentation.



## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PHASE I: MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

### **August Activities**

The discrete event Simulation project is in its final phase. Output from the trouser manufacturing plant model are attached.

### **Plans for September**

Continue development of a generic model of a utility trouser manufacturing plant.

Interpret data from N.C. State.

September 11, 1989

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** W. C. Tincher

**FROM:** J. T. Sommerfeld

**SUBJECT:** Discrete-Event Simulation Phase of DOD/DLA Project

This monthly report summarizes key output statistics from the discrete-event simulation (with GPSS) of an industrial utility trousers manufacturing plant (Coastal Industries in Selma, Alabama). These results are based upon a nominal production capacity of 40,000 pairs of trousers per week for this facility, and are given for the cases of both underfeeding and overfeeding of fabric rolls to the mill. The latter case represents unbalanced operation, since there are several batteries of work stations in this simulated mill (creasing of front pockets, closing of waist band ends, creasing of back pockets) whose maximum capacity is exactly equal to 40,000 pairs/week, corresponding to an average processing time of 0.06 min/pair. Thus, it is significant to note, for the case of overfeeding simulations, that these results are for a 4-week production period following a 2-week startup period. Since imbalance implies unsteady-state operation, the inventory results would monotonically increase for production periods greater than four weeks, until saturation of the model (and mill also, for that matter) would occur, unless correction action(s) were implemented.

The table below then summarizes the production and inventory results for both underfeeding (<40,000) and overfeeding (>40,000 pairs/week) cases.

<b>Feed Rate of Rolls to Cutter, pairs/wk</b>	<b><u>Production,pairs/wk</u></b>	<b><u>Work-In-Process Inventory</u></b>	<b><u>Total parts</u></b>
		<b><u>Total pairs</u></b>	
UNDERFEEDING			
36,920	36,920	26,560	62,880
38,400	38,400	27,680	65,120
BALANCED OPERATION			
40,000	40,000	28,800	67,840
OVERFEEDING			
41,740	40,000	39,360	126,800
43,640	40,000	50,720	137,440

All of the above results correspond to a total of 255 work stations in this mill (comparable to the actual number). The above production figures are readily obtained from the total number of transactions exiting the GPSS model over the 4-week production period (1 GPSS transaction = 160 pairs). Similarly, the total number of parts (front pockets and panels, back pockets and panels, waist bands, etc.) is directly related to the total number of transactions resident in the GPSS model at the end of the 4-week production period. Determination of the total number of pairs of trousers in the work-in-process inventory, on the other hand, requires summation of all of the GPSS transactions resident in the model along one of the critical manufacturing paths. Both of the in-process inventory figures (total pairs and parts) are seen to increase dramatically with the onset of overfeeding. Company management reports a work-in-process inventory figure of about 77,000 pairs of trousers at a production level of 43,000 pairs/week, which inventory figure is somewhat higher than that indicated by the above simulation results. It is not clear, however, whether this latter inventory figure actually represents total pairs or total parts, or some combination thereof. Also, both the precise state of the mill (number of work stations for each of the 37 individual operations) and duration of production at this higher level are not known; there may have been, for example, some reallocation or addition of resources to accommodate this higher production level.

Work is currently in progress on the development of a generic discrete-event simulation model (still using GPSS) of a utility trousers manufacturing facility. The parts flow configuration for this generic model will be the same as that at Southern Tech's Advanced Apparel Manufacturing Technology Demonstration (AAMTD) Center. The nominal production capacity in this generic model will also be 40,000 pairs of trousers per week, or 8,000 pairs/day. Unit processing times for the individual operation will be taken from the North Carolina State University (NCSU) Apparel Manufacturing database, including means and standard deviations for Gaussian or normal distributions thereof.

# **PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

## **APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018-0004**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890801 - 890831**

**Submitted By:**

**Susan Griffin**

**Economic Development Laboratory**

**Georgia Tech Research Institute**

**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**September 15, 1989**

**Sponsored By:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 080189 - 083189

E-19-644



October 30, 1989


Ms. Sara Williams  
Defense Electronics Supply Center  
CO  
Attn: PSC  
1507 Wilmington Pike  
Dayton, Ohio 45444-5208

**SUBJECT: AMTC Monthly Reports**  
**Performance Period: 090189-093089**

Dear Ms. Williams:

Please find the captioned reports of Georgia Tech and Southern Tech activities for your review.

Cordially,

  
Susan Griffin  
Associate Project Director  
Apparel Manufacturing Technology Center

Attachments

rlg:

cc: John Adams, Project Director  
Mr. Dan Gearing, COTR

**SEPTEMBER MONTHLY REPORTS**  
**APPAREL MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CENTER**  
**CONTRACT NUMBER: DLA900-87-D-0018**  
**PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 890901 - 890930**

**Submitted by:**

**Economic Development Laboratory**  
**Georgia Tech Research Institute**  
**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**Sponsored by:**

**THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**  
**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

*October 20, 1989*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Section I:</b>	<b>Technical Reports</b>
	<b>Base Contract</b>
	<b>Short Term Research Tasks</b>
<b>Section II:</b>	<b>Data Accession List</b>
<b>Section III:</b>	<b>Program Schedules</b>
	<b>Base Contract</b>
	<b>Short Term Research Tasks</b>



## **SECTION I**

## **CLIN 0010: SEPTEMBER TECHNICAL REPORT**

### **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING**

#### Administrative

Measuring the Effectiveness of the AAMTDC and Cut Order Planning were funded during September.

All AMTC Researchers met on September 22 to finalize Annual Report and Contract Briefing preparations.

All advisory board and coalition members received an invitation to the Annual Contract Briefing.

#### Workshops

Registration confirmations were sent to October 11 workshop participants.

Workshop speakers are as follows:

Chuck Marsh, William Carter Company  
Mike Biggerstaff, Health-Tex, Inc.  
Becca McClendon, Kurt Salmon Associates  
Joe Brefeld, U.S. Shoe Corp.  
Tom Burchard, U.S. Shoe Corp.

In addition to the presentations, Health-Tex and KSA will have video footage of real-world modular groups in action.

AMTC will feature a modular system in the pilot plant during the afternoon session of the workshop. The demonstration will include the manufacture of AMTC's utility trousers as well as a modular unit producing camp shorts. H.D. Lee loaned AMTC the necessary equipment to set up the modular system.

#### Presentations and Industry Events

Wayne Tincher and John Adams made a presentation about AMTC and its research efforts during a Bobbin Show session.

Georgia Tech and Southern Tech publicized AMTC to industry and alumni in its booth at the Bobbin Show. The booth was sponsored in conjunction with the Georgia Textile Education Foundation, who also recruits students at the show.

## OUTREACH

The September issue of the AMTC *Quarterly* was distributed to 1600 industrialists on the AMTC mailing list as well as Bobbin Show attendees.

Work is continuing on the video about the Generic Architecture project.

A new Georgia Tech publication was completed during September. Success Stories: Georgia Tech Around the State describes many industry assistance projects in which Georgia Tech has engaged. One section is devoted to work in the textile and apparel industry and includes information about AMTC. Success Stories will be sent to various industry executives and university advocates to promote Georgia Tech programs. Copies of the publication are available upon request.

Georgia Tech is conducting a project for the Georgia Appalachian Regional Commission. The purpose is to determine the level of technology currently employed by apparel manufacturers in the North Georgia area. Susan Griffin is working on the project which includes the development of a questionnaire and "scoring" system. These products will be available for AMTC's use in future industry outreach/assistance projects.

## **DEMONSTRATION PLANT OPERATIONS**

### **Demonstrations**

Tom Heckman, Department of Commerce, visited AMTC on September 20.

Six international representatives of Coats & Clark toured AMTC.

More than 30 students from Southern Tech's Manufacturing Methods classes participated in an in-depth tour and demonstration at the center. Many Industrial Engineering classes are utilizing the facilities to familiarize students with apparel manufacturing technology and provide hands-on experience in a manufacturing environment.

Aaron Efrid, Vice President of Seagoing Uniforms, and two of his plant managers toured AMTC and discussed manufacturing methods demonstrated and their application to operations at Seagoing.

Other visitors are noted on the Data Accession List.

### **Equipment**

Two representatives of PROFEEL visited the center and demonstrated their pneumatic ply alignment device and pneumatic floatation positioning device for seaming. The former will be used to seam shorts in the modular unit. The latter will be adapted to the YKK zipper machine to aid in the placement of the flies.

Sharon Palmer of BZA met with technicians to discuss installing and training on the KARAT software. This should occur during the next two months.

Hewlett Packard met with AMTC staff members to discuss implementation of computer network for AMTC's computer integrated manufacturing system. This network should be operational at the December workshop.

During the Bobbin Show, several contacts were made which resulted in the acquisition of a Brother BAS 350 and a Reece Pocket Welt Machine.

### **Student Projects**

The Department Head of Southern Tech's Computer Science Department met with AMTC staff members to discuss student projects. Two projects have been identified: computer program modifications for ACS and modifications for Gerber Garment Technology CAD system. Computer Science students are currently working on the ACS project. Future projects were also discussed.

### ACS Computer Systems Operation

Reloading of the ACS software was completed September 12. An update to the existing software was also attempted, however, AS400 memory capacity was not sufficient.

Roy Wendell of ACS met with Southern Tech staff members and students during the Bobbin Show. Problems associated with the software's handling of multiple bundle sizes per style were discussed. It is generally felt that the software can be modified to manage the multiple bundle concept, and a design revision will be undertaken to alleviate the problem. Three Southern Tech students have been assigned to the project.

## RESEARCH

Design and Development of a Generic Architecture - Industry interest in this project continues. AAMA's CIM/COM Committee has established a new sub-committee to review the architecture project. A copy of the model was sent to Dan Wilson, Chairman of the sub-committee.

Work is continuing on a 20 minute video describing the project. The document is being developed for DLA, however, researchers will also use it to publicize the project.

Work is continuing on the information architecture; the first version is expected to be completed by the end of October.

Knowledge-Based Framework for Trouser Procurement - Statistical analysis of questionnaire data continues. Because of the modest response, researchers are determining areas where additional information must be obtained to ensure validity of the study.

Analysis of Defects - The first prototype for fabric defects analysis is nearing completion. Researchers are developing a scheme for classification of sewing defects. The classification will be along the lines of the one developed for the classification of fabric defects. Efforts will be made to visit Coastal Industries and other apparel manufacturers to gather more information on defects. Because of the modest response, researchers are determining areas where additional information must be obtained to ensure validity of the study.

Discrete Event Simulation - Work continues to focus on the generic discrete event simulation model of a trousers plant, using the parts flow configuration of the AMTC pilot plant. Activities during September revolved around the center and its Mr. Engineer software. Technicians have been studying unit processing times for operations to manufacture the utility trousers.

Researchers are also preparing for the December 5 workshop where the model will be introduced to industry as well as students. The project will be completed by the end of the year.

Ergonomic Principles - The first phase of the project was completed in September. Anthropometric data and interview data from 3 plant sites were summarized and presented in the Phase I Report.

If possible, additional data will be collected at other plants during Phase II.

Next month, researchers will test possible solutions to problems identified in Phase I.

In-Process Quality Control: Fabric Defects - Color data has been collected on denim fabric. Thirty samples of trouser fabric have been received and will serve as the basis for an automatic inspection system. Data is currently being analyzed.

In-Process Quality Control: Sewing Defects - Working on another Georgia Tech project, Lew Dorrity visited several Japanese apparel manufacturers in September. He was able to discuss the sewing defects project with them, particularly the area of transducing signals and their approaches to the problem.

Matt Sikorski continued his efforts to debug subroutines on the CRATE data collection equipment.

Next month, the team plans a trip to Coastal Industries to review the defects list and possible additions/revisions.

Improved Marker Making Systems - Previous correspondence with all companies was followed up by telephone. Contacts were found and agreements for participation in the project were formed with the following companies:

Gerber Garment Technology  
Microdynamics, Inc.  
Polygon Software Co.  
CDI Technologies, Inc.

An outline of the vendor questionnaire was started. The types of information that will be solicited include (1) users of the system, (2) cost factors in developing the system, (3) technical abilities of the system, and (4) ideas and views on improvements and/or automation of marker systems in general. This questionnaire was put on hold due to questions that arose regarding the economic feasibility study.

Next month, researchers will enlist the assistance of AMTC's Dr. William B. Riall in conducting the economic feasibility study.

The literature search will be completed and reviewed in two areas:

1. Examination of the underlying "cutting stock problem" in industrial engineering and related journals, and
2. Examination of existing economic justification techniques in the apparel industry and how they can be applied to marker making systems.

Researchers will request from participating vendors any brochures, manuals, or other printed information about their existing marker making system. Demonstration diskettes will also be requested if available.

Flexible Work Group Methods - On-line literature search for relevant information regarding Flexible Work Groups (FWG) was begun.

Mike Brown conducted a tour of the demonstration center for two project team members, John Bartholdi from the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering (ISyE), and Richard Carey from the Economic Development Laboratory (EDL). Although none of the equipment was demonstrated, they were able to see and obtain information about the computing facilities and the manufacturing area.

Mike Brown attended the breakfast held by the Technical Advisory Committee of AAMA at the Bobbin Show. The presentation was entitled "Making the Revolution Work: How to Implement Flexible Apparel Manufacturing Through People." He collected a copy of this report for AMTC files.

Next month, a meeting of the entire project team will be held. The purpose is to discuss orientation, project plans, and answer questions, etc. Project members will also attend the Modular Manufacturing Workshop and the Annual Contract Briefing at Southern Tech.

Researchers will review and evaluate equipment in the Interactive Design and Analysis Laboratory for possible needed upgrades and/or additional purchases required for the VME. The team will also explore Georgia Tech funding sources for additional equipment.

Specifications will be made for the local area network hardware and software to be implemented in the Interactive Design and Analysis Lab.

Researchers will identify research issues and models relevant to the concept of flexible work groups. These will be used in the continuing literature search and review.

Initial plans for site visits will be made. Researchers want to observe current work methods and gather relevant information for the emulation of flexible work groups.

Measuring the Effectiveness of AAMTDC - Project Initiation Package and Deliverables Schedule were received. A kick-off meeting will be held October 27 at Southern Tech to discuss visitor classification system, development of technological base line, implementation of other measurement systems, and coordination with equipment vendors and military agencies for data collection purposes.



## SECTION II

**DATA ACCESSION LIST  
SEPTEMBER 1989**

Bassett Walker  
Martinsville, VA

Dennis Beasley  
Systecon  
Duluth, GA

Dan Blitch  
Chandon Ltd  
Thomson, GA

Kyle Bortnight  
Shaw Company  
Dalton, GA

Jeremy Branne  
J & P Coats (Caribbean) Ltd.  
Trinidad

Gary Brasher  
I.C. Isaacs & Co.  
Carthage, MS

Jim Bray  
J.W. Bray Co.  
Soddy Daisy, TN

J.W. Bray, Jr.  
J.W. Bray Co.  
Soddy Daisy, TN

Robert Brooks  
Shaw Company  
Dalton, GA

Coats & Clark  
International Representatives

Herb Duncan  
VWC  
Atlanta, GA

Kesha Dupree  
J.W. Bray Co.  
Soddy Daisy, TN

Jim Gilmer  
Craftex, Inc.  
Latta, SC

Tom Heckman  
Department of Commerce

Harry Holding  
The Hartwell Co.  
Hartwell, GA

Jim Ivey  
Shaw Co.  
Dalton, GA

Randy Jay  
Atlanta Journal & Constitution

Dan Kazzez  
Paperfree  
Washington, DC

Ken Keene  
I.C. Isaacs & Co.  
Carthage, MS

Charles Marshall  
Marshall & Gross, Inc.  
Marietta, GA

Ray O'Connell  
O'Neill Developments  
Marietta, GA

Dick Plunkett  
Sewell Co.  
Bremen, GA

Warren Ragsdale  
Southern Bell  
Atlanta, GA

Harry Riehle  
Systecon  
Duluth, GA

Roy Simmons  
Charter  
Marietta, GA

Terry Stein  
Carter & Associates  
Atlanta, GA

Sandy Thompson  
North Metro Tech  
Acworth, GA

Jeff Whalen  
Warren Featherbone  
Athens, GA

Jay Whorton  
Marietta Daily

Dick Yardley  
Kuris High Tech Systems  
Norcross, GA

### **SECTION III**

TASK ITEM	YEAR	1				2				3				4				5			
	Quarter	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
DEMONSTRATION PLANT																					
- Establishment		↑		↑																	
- Demonstrations																					
Major				↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑	
Minor				↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑	
COALITION																					
- Establishment		↑		↑																	
- Operation & Maintenance		↑																			↑
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER																					
- AMIS				↑																	↑
- Publicity		↑																			↑
ECONOMICS ANALYSES		↑		↑																	
ADVISORY COMM. MEETINGS		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑		↑	
REPORTING																					
- Monthly (3 / quarter)		↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
- Quarterly		↑	↑	↑	↑																
- Annually				↑				↑				↑				↑				↑	

SITE  
PERPETUATION 

# APPAREL ADVANCED MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	YEAR	1												2											
	MONTH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<b>PHASE I FUNCTION ARCHITECTURE</b> Review Industrial Practices Develop Functional Architecture Specifications Build Model and Document  Technical Report		↑	↑	↑	↑		↑	↑	↑	↑															
<b>PHASE II INFORMATION ARCHITECTURE</b> Study Information in Industry Develop Hierarchial Info. Flow Develop Information Architecture Specifications Build Model and Document  Technical Report								↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
<b>PHASE III DYNAMICS ARCHITECTURE</b> Construct "What If" Scenarios Analyze Information Transfer Develop Dynamics Arch. and Simulate & Doc. Model Develop Generic Apparel Arch.  Technical Report														↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑

## GENERIC ARCHITECTURE FOR APPAREL MANUFACTURING PROGRAM SCHEDULE


PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	YEAR	1												2											
	MONTH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
PHASE I Review Past Research Efforts Develop & Refine Ind. Questionnaire Collect Info. Through Questionnaire Analyze Results of Questionnaire  Technical Report		↑		↑																					
			↑			↑																			
				↑			↑																		
						↑		↑				↑													
												↑													
PHASE II Develop Structured Rep. of Current Practice Define Additional Factors Interact Findings with Industry Develop Ranking Scheme  Technical Report									↑				↑												
										↑			↑												
											↑		↑				↑								
												↑	↑				↑								
													↑				↑								
PHASE III Implementation: Programming, Debugging, Manual Development Field Testing and Refinement  Tech. Report and Installation																									
																↑									
																				↑					
																				↑				↑	
																								↑	

## KNOWLEDGE-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR TROUSER PROCUREMENT PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089






## ANALYSIS OF DEFECTS IN TROUSER MANUFACTURING PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adeption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089



## PRINCIPLES OF ERGONOMICS PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Literature survey	↑		↑																					
Collect data from manufacturers			↑					↑																
Phase II:																								
Study sensor technology								↑								↑								
Evaluate applicability														↑		↑								
Evaluate manufacturers defect detection systems												↑				↑								
Phase III:																								
Assemble data system																	↑					↑		
Test sensors on site, debug																		↑					↑	
Documentation of results																						↑	↑	↑

**IN PROCESS QUALITY CONTROL: SEWING DEFECTS  
PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089**

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Survey existing technology	↑		↑																					
Identify & define defects	↑			↑																				
Define defect optical properties			↑		↑																			
Lighting & optics design				↑		↑																		
Test design concepts					↑	↑																		
Phase II:																								
Develop machine vision algorithms							↑			↑														
Design software							↑		↑						↑									
Develop color analysis system							↑				↑													
Develop conceptual model										↑								↑						
Design & construct modules													↑					↑						
Test modules																	↑	↑						
Phase III:																								
Acquire components																			↑	↑				
Assemble inspection system																				↑				
Test and demonstrate																						↑		↑
Final report																							↑	↑

## IN PROCESS QUALITY CONTROL: FABRIC DEFECTS PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Month											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Study of Existing Systems												
Contact Vendors	●●	●●										
Study of Various Systems		●●	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO				
User Site Visits		OO	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO				
Technical Analysis												
Literature Review	●●	●●	OO									
Analytical Study		●●	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO					
Formulation of New Ideas					OO	OO	OO	OO				
Technical Analysis									OO	OO		
Cost Analysis												
Cost Data Collection for Existing Systems		OO	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO	OO			
Cost Estimates for Proposed New Systems							OO	OO	OO	OO		
Analysis										OO	OO	
Reporting												OO

## IMPROVED MARKER MAKING PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

and SUBTASK ITEM	Phase I												Phase II											
Month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Study Existing FWG's																								
Literature Review	000	000	000	000	000	000																		
Site Visits					000	000	000	000	000	000	000													
Summary of Findings												000												
Study of Current Work Methods																								
Site Visits	000	000	000	000																				
Data Collection				000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000												
Analysis of FWG																								
Literature Review	000	000	000	000	000	000																		
Modeling and Analysis					000	000																		
Design of Methodology					000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000						
Experimentation															000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
Summary of Results																		000	000	000	000	000	000	000
Development of VME																								
Specifications	000	000																						
Hardware Implementation			000	000	000	000	000	000																
Software Implementation			000	000	000	000	000	000	000															
Design Database					000	000	000	000																
Design and implement					000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000									
Initial Prototype																								
Refinement and Expansion															000									
Demonstration 1																000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
Demonstration 2																								000
Establish Experimental FWG																								
Identification of Workers													000											
Training														000	000									
Experimentation and Observation															000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
Data Collection															000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
Reporting																								
Phase I												000												
Phase II																							000	000

## Flexible Work Groups

### Program Schedule

#### Exhibit 3.6

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Phase I :										
List programs & activities to be tracked	000000									
Develop a computer based filing system	000000	000000								
Develop questionnaire to assess industry changes		000000	000000							
Phase II:										
Review existing tracking & enter into database				000000						
Implement new tracking & enter into database					000000	000000	000000			
Inform industry and AAMTD vendors about program				000000						
Visit DLA contractor to gather cost data					000000	000000				
Distribute questionnaires							000000			
Phase III:										
Evaluate questionnaire feedback								0000000	000000	
Estimate cost savings on military garments								0000000	000000	
Evaluate compiled data									000000	
Prepare final report										000000

**MEASURING AAMTD EFFECTIVENESS  
PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

**PERFORMANCE PERIOD 090189 - 093089**



## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION**

### **I. PROJECT REVIEW FOR OCTOBER**

#### **I.1 Introduction**

The DLA project has completed its tenth month of program work. The technical and administrative project management is under the supervision of Jude T. Sommerfeld, the project Principal Investigator. This monthly report summarizes task activities and technical progress on the project during October of 1989.

#### **I.2 Project Personnel**

In addition to Dr. Sommerfeld, project personnel continuing to contribute include Dr. Wayne Tincher and Ms. Pamela Rosser, an undergraduate student research assistant in GTRI/EDL. This monthly report was compiled by Dr. Sommerfeld and Ms. Rosser.

#### **I.3 Project Expenditures**

Expenditures in all categories remain within the budgeted contractual expenditures for this project. A 3-month, no-cost extension of the project has been requested in order to encumber the travel funds required for Dr. Sommerfeld to attend and make a technical presentation on this project at the Advanced Apparel Manufacturing Technology Demonstration Conference in February at the Philadelphia College of Textiles and Sciences.

#### **I.4 Travel**

No travel activity in October.

## **II. RESEARCH STATUS**

### **II.1 Validation of Demonstration Model**

Validation of the model (coded in GPSS language) of a demonstration plant was completed on schedule in September. This plant manufactures utility trousers, and is a traditional facility requiring manual attendance at each of its 250 work stations. Key output results from this model are in agreement with actual plant data at a nominal production level of 40,000 pair/week. Thus, this production rate requires 261 work stations, and there are 1-2 weeks of WIP inventory at the plant.

### **II.2 Development of High-Tech Model**

Work commenced in October on development of a second GPSS model, this one of a plant employing high-tech methods for trouser manufacture, and more adaptable to modular manufacturing. The materials flow configuration for this high-tech model will be the same as that at AMTC. The coding of this second model in the GPSS language has been completed. It remains to input the unit processing times for the various manufacturing operations; these will be obtained from available databases, such as Mr. Engineer or the NCSU Apparel Manufacturing compilation.

### **II.3 Installation at the AMTC Pilot Plant**

Both of the models described above will be installed on PCs at AMTC. Application demonstrations of the first, and possibly second, model will be given during December.

### **II.4 Documentation of Results**

A draft write-up documenting the first GPSS model for inclusion in the project final report has been prepared. It is also planned to submit this document for prospective publication in the International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology. Work on documentation of the second GPSS model will commence within the next 2-3 weeks.

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑		↑													
Validation of model						↑			↑		↑													
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑	↑	↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑	↑	↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center										↑	↑	↑												
Documentation of results										↑	↑	↑												

DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION  
PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: 100189 - 103189

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION**

### ***I. Project Review for November***

#### ***I.1 Introduction***

The DLA project on Discrete-Event Simulation Applied to Apparel Manufacturing has completed its eleventh month of program work. The technical and administrative project management is under the supervision of Jude T. Sommerfeld, the project Principal Investigator. This monthly report summarizes task activities and technical progress on this project during November of 1989.

#### ***I.2 Project Personnel***

In addition to Dr. Sommerfeld, project personnel contributing to this project include Dr. Wayne C. Tincher and Ms. Pamela S. Rosser, an undergraduate student research assistant in GTRI/EDL. This monthly report was compiled by Dr. Sommerfeld and Ms. Rosser.

#### ***I.3 Travel***

There was no travel associated with this phase of the project during November.

### ***II. Research Status***

#### ***II.1 Development of Hi-Tech Plant Model***

Initial estimates of unit processing times in a hi-tech plant have been developed and input to the GPSS model. These processing times are characterized by means and standard deviations in a normal or Gaussian distribution, so as to simulate human and stochastic factors.

#### ***II.2 Installation at the AMTC Pilot Plant***

Neither GPSS model (demonstration or hi-tech) of a trousers plant has yet been installed at the AMTC pilot plant for two reasons: 1) cancellation of the December workshop and 2) unavailability of an appropriate PC at Southern Tech.

### *II.3 Documentation of Results*

The write-up documenting the first GPSS model (demonstration plant) has been completed and will be submitted to DLA in December.

### *III. Plans For Next Month*

#### *III.1 Development of Hi-Tech Plant Model*

A primary activity of next month's effort will be debugging of the hi-tech plant model. Simulation of various production scenarios can then begin with this model.

#### *III.2 Installation at the AMTC Pilot Plant*

It is still hoped to install one or both of the GPSS models on a PC at the AMTC pilot plant. Failing that, a PC will be borrowed for demonstration purposes at the next workshop, currently scheduled for March.

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection	↑	↑																						
(demonstration mill)	↑		↑																					
Model Development	↑																							
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑	↑	↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adeption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation											↑	↑												
of the AAMTD center																								
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE PERIOD 110189 - 113089

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION

### *I. Project Review for December*

#### *I.1 Introduction*

The DLA project on Discrete-Event Simulation Applied to Apparel Manufacturing has completed its twelfth month of program work. The technical and administrative project management is under the supervision of Jude T. Sommerfeld, the project Principal Investigator. This monthly report summarizes task activities and technical progress on this project during December of 1989.

#### *I.2 Project Personnel*

In addition to Dr. Sommerfeld, project personnel contributing to this project include Dr. Wayne C. Tincher and Ms. Pamela S. Rosser, an undergraduate student research assistant in GTRI/EDL. This monthly report was compiled by Dr. Sommerfeld and Ms. Rosser.

#### *I.3 Travel*

There was no travel associated with the project during December.

## ***II. Research Status***

### ***II.1 Development of Hi-Tech Plant Model***

The discrete-event model of a high tech trouser plant is now operational. Using GPSS/PC, the model has built-in human and stochastic factors. Each unit processing time is represented by a Gaussian distribution, with the standard deviation being 15 percent of the mean. Thus, the actual processing time will be within 30 percent of the mean approximately 95 percent of the time.

## ***III. Plans For Next Month***

### ***III.1 Development of Hi-Tech Plant Model***

Simulation of various production scenarios with the high-tech model will begin in January. Such scenarios could represent changes in number of workstations, efficiency of workstations, application of new technology, etc.

### ***III.2 Presentation at Philadelphia Conference***

Earlier in the project, a GPSS model of a real-world trousers manufacturing plant was developed. A presentation on this model will be made at the Advanced Apparel Manufacturing Technology Demonstration Conference in February.



SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑		↑													
Validation of model						↑			↑		↑													
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adaption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center										↑		↑												
Documentation of results										↑		↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

PERIOD ENDING 120189 - 123189

## **DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION**

### ***I. Project Review for January***

#### ***II.1 Introduction***

This project has completed its thirteenth month of program work. The technical and administrative project management is under the supervision of Jude Sommerfeld, the project's principal investigator. This monthly report summarizes task activities and technical progress on this project during January.

#### ***I.2 Project Personnel***

In addition to Dr. Sommerfeld, project personnel continuing to contribute to this project include Dr. Wayne Tincher and Ms. Pamela Rosser, an undergraduate student research assistant in GTRI/EDL. This report was compiled by Dr. Sommerfeld and Ms. Rosser.

#### ***I.3 Travel***

There was no travel during January.

### ***II. Research Status***

#### ***II.1 Development of Hi-Tech Plant Model***

Initial production scenarios investigated by simulation with the GPSS/PC model of a hi-tech trouser manufacturing plant have explored the effects of stochasticism (e.g., deriving from human factors) on production. This model has shown that, as the standard deviation is increased to 20 percent of the mean value in a normal distribution of each of the 33 processing steps, production falls only by 1 percent. This small decrease probably results from the large size and balance of the subject plant.

#### ***II.2 Documentation of Results***

A 50-page manuscript entitle "Discrete-Event Simulation of Trouser Manufacturing" was submitted in early February for prospective publication as a paper in the International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology. This manuscript, describing our earlier work on demonstration and validation of discrete-event modeling of trousers manufacturing, will also form an integral part of the final report on the project.

### ***III. Plans for Next Month***

#### ***III.1 Usage of Hi-Tech Model***

Production scenarios remaining to be investigated with the GPSS/PC model of a hi-tech plant include:

- employee absenteeism
- new trainees
- new, more efficient hardware, both on and off the critical manufacturing path

#### ***III.2 Demonstration at March Workshop***

A presentation and demonstration of the application of discrete-event simulation to trouser manufacturing will be given on March 7th to attendees of the AMTC workshop.

SHORT TERM TASK and SUBTASK ITEM	Year 1												Year 2											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Phase I :																								
Data collection (demonstration mill)	↑	↑																						
Model Development	↑		↑																					
Phase II:																								
GPSS coding of model				↑					↑															
Data collection for model							↑		↑															
Validation of model						↑			↑															
Phase III:																								
Case studies for model verification										↑		↑												
Adeption to modular manufacturing										↑		↑												
Installation of the simulation of the AAMTD center											↑	↑												
Documentation of results											↑	↑												

## DISCRETE EVENT SIMULATION PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Performance Period 1-1-90 to 1-31-90

E-17-644

**DISCRETE-EVENT SIMULATION  
APPLIED TO APPAREL  
MANUFACTURING**

**by**

**Jude T. Sommerfeld  
Wayne C. Tincher  
Pamela S. Rosser**

**Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, Georgia 30332**

**FINAL REPORT**

**for**

**Defense Logistics Agency  
U. S. Department of Defense**

**June, 1990**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Figures.....	vi
List of Appendices.....	ix
Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Queuing Theory.....	3
Discrete-Event Simulation.....	4
GPSS Processor.....	5
Prior Applications.....	7
Utility Trouser Plant Configuration.....	9

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Preliminary Modeling Considerations.....	16
Utility Trouser Plant Model.....	19
Simulation Results from Utility Trouser Plant Model.....	33
Hi-Tech Trouser Plant Configuration.....	42
Hi-Tech Trouser Plant Model.....	50
Simulation Results from Hi-Tech Trouser Plant Model.....	63
Conclusions.....	76
References.....	78
Appendices.....	81

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I      Work Stations in Utility Trouser Manufacturing Plant.....	12
II     Production Routes in the Manufacture of Utility Trousers.....	37
III    Manufacturing Residence Times as Functions of the Plant Feed Rate.....	39
IV     Most Utilized Work Stations at a Balanced Production Level (40,000 pairs/week or 0.06 min/pair).....	41
V      Most Crowded Queues at a Balanced Production Level.....	43
VI     Work Stations in Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing Plant.....	46
VII    Critical Manufacturing Route in the Production of Trousers.....	65



LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
VIII	
Summary of Effects of Stochasticism on Trouser Production and Inventory.....	68
IX	
Key Results from Simulation of Various Production Scenarios (all with 15% Stochasticism).....	70

## LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Material flow configuration for trouser manufacturing plant. ....	11
2. GPSS model segment 1 - spreading, cutting and labelling. ....	20
3. Definition of conceptual QEDAL macro block, representing the sequence of QUEUE - ENTER - DEPART - ADVANCE - LEAVE blocks. ....	23
4. GPSS model segment 2 - back pockets. ....	24
5. GPSS model segment 3 - back panels. ....	26
6. GPSS model segments 4 - right and left flies - and 5 - front pockets. ....	28
7. GPSS model segment 6 - front panels and pockets. ....	29
8. GPSS model segments 7 - waist bands - and 8 - fronts and backs. ....	30

## LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
9. GPSS model segments 9 - belt loops - and 10 - timer. ....	32
10. Production and WIP inventories as functions of plant feed rate. ....	35
11. Material flow configuration for high-technology trouser manufacturing plant. ....	45
12. GPSS model segment A -- spreading, cutting and bundling. ....	52
13. Definition of conceptual QEDAAL macro block for operation n, representing the sequence of QUEUE- ENTER-DEPART-ASSIGN-ADVANCE-LEAVE blocks. ....	55
14. GPSS model segments B -- back pockets -- and C -- back panels. ....	56
15. GPSS model segments D -- right and left flies -- and E -- front pockets. ....	58
16. GPSS model segment F -- front panels. ....	59

## LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
17. GPSS model segment G -- belt loops. ....	60
18. GPSS model segments H -- finished trousers -- and I -- timer. ....	62
19. Effect of stochasticism in the individual unit operations on trouser production rate. ....	67

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
A	
Coding for GPSS Model of a Utility Trouser Manufacturing Plant.....	81
B	
Sample Output from GPSS Model of a Utility Trouser Manufacturing Plant (Balanced Operation).....	88
C	
Coding for GPSS Model of a Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing Plant.....	96
D	
Sample Output from GPSS Model of a Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing Plant (Base Case of 15% Stochasticism).....	103
E	
Sample Output from GPSS Model of a Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing Plant (Ideal Case of Perfect Balancing and No Stochasticism).....	111

## SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a project directed toward discrete-event simulation of apparel (specifically, trousers) manufacturing. Thus, the first major topic covered is a description of the discrete-event simulation of a utility trouser manufacturing plant. The simulation model, written in the GPSS/PC language, was validated with operating data from a large plant with a nominal production capacity of 40,000 pairs of men's denim trousers per week. Specifically, the simulation results closely agreed with key plant operating figures, such as production rate, number of work stations, work-in-process inventory and residence time in production.

This first phase of the project was then followed by the construction of another discrete-event simulation model, again using the GPSS/PC system, to explore various production scenarios in a high-technology trouser plant, with a nominal production capacity of 8,000 pairs per day. Specifically, the effects of stochasticism, deriving from human factors and represented by the normal distribution, in the various cutting and sewing operations were investigated with this second model. Effects measured included production rate, work-in-process (WIP) inventory and manufacturing residence time. Production scenarios simulated were absent workers, new employee training and the introduction of more efficient equipment.

## Introduction

Simulation has been a commonly accepted engineering tool and manufacturing aid in many industries for more than thirty years now. Specifically, discrete-event simulation [1] is commonly employed by industries engaged in discrete parts or items manufacturing, e.g., machine tools, vehicles, appliances, etc. Very few applications of simulation and, particularly, of discrete-event simulation in the textile and clothing industries have been reported in the literature, however.

The manufacture of apparel, of all sorts, can be described as a sequence of parallel and consecutive discrete events, each with its own characteristic inputs, outputs and time requirements. Thus, such a manufacturing system readily lends itself to discrete-event simulation. Traditionally, the clothing industry has not been particularly noted for the development of sophisticated new technology or new manufacturing systems [2]. However, in the recent past and with the pressures of quick-response manufacturing, this industry has shown renewed interest in applications of computer-based tools to manufacturing systems. Simulation, which has been a widely used tool in other industries, has received considerable attention for its possible applications in apparel manufacturing.

To date, however, little application of discrete-event simulation in the overall textile industry (knitting/weaving, finishing, apparel manufacture) has been reported in the open literature. In one of the few known studies in this area, the General Purpose Simulation System (GPSS) was used to model and perform a discrete-event simulation of a large textile finishing mill, producing a variety of woven and knit fabrics for sheeting and men's and women's apparel [3]. This model was validated with actual mill operating data. Simulations were made to determine the effects of market demands, maintenance practices, quality control policies, and total production on equipment and manpower utilization, work-in-process (WIP) inventory, and total processing time, such as measured in any just-in-time (JIT) program. There also recently appeared a simplified application of GPSS/H to the modelling of T-shirt manufacturing (4).

### Queuing Theory

Many manufacturing processes may be viewed as a series of service operations and waiting lines (queues). Many problems of interest to engineers have to do with the formation and length of queues. For example, a bundle of back pockets (denoted as a transaction) that has passed through a hemming operation and is waiting for the next work station (facility) to become available is considered to be in a queue. Intermediate staging areas may also be viewed as queues of limited capacity. Insofar as human



factors are often an element of queuing theory problems, interarrival times (between successive transactions) and processing times are frequently characterized by probability distributions, introducing a stochastic aspect.

Only a small number of queuing problems, generally of minimal size and invoking standard probability distributions, may be solved analytically [5]. Such a simple example would be a single battery of identical, parallel work stations (denoted as a storage), at which transactions arrive in a fashion characterized by the exponential probability distribution, and where the service time at any one of the identical facilities is also assumed to be exponentially distributed. When there is no analytical solution, however, or when the standard probability distributions do not reflect the actual process, engineers usually turn to simulation techniques.

#### Discrete-Event Simulation

Thus, discrete-event simulators were originally developed as numerical aids to solve complex queuing theory problems, not amenable to analytical solution. In such systems, state variables change only at discrete sets of points in time (as opposed to a continuous system, wherein state variables change continuously over time). Queuing problems occur routinely in the field of industrial engineering; typical examples include machine shops, materials handling facilities, customer service stations, and transportation

networks.

Discrete simulators have a time clock. The proper scheduling of events in time is a formidable task and is typically implemented by the internal logic of the processor. In order to support the modelling of human or random factors, most such simulators also have one or more built-in random-number generators. Output from these latter is used to sample event times (or durations between time events) from various probability distributions, of which the simplest is the uniform or rectangular distribution. That is, an interarrival or service time can take the form  $a \pm b$ , where  $a$  represents the mean value and  $b$  is the half-width, in appropriate time units, of the distribution. Empirical, user-developed distribution functions, e.g., from a plant histogram, can also be supplied by an analyst. These time distributions are clearly key inputs to the simulation model.

#### GPSS Processor

The progenitor of discrete-event simulation systems is GPSS [6, 7], which dates back to 1959 and is still used extensively in many manufacturing sectors. Because of its easy use, availability, reliability, and efficient operation (integer arithmetic only in many versions), GPSS is a very effective tool if only discrete simulation capability is required. Other popular discrete-event

simulation systems include SIMULA [8] (more prevalent in Europe) and SIMSCRIPT [9].

There are 50-60 (depending upon the version) different precoded functional subroutines, called blocks and generally written in the FORTRAN or C language, in GPSS. The transactions which move from block to block in a GPSS model have associated with them various parameters (such as priority and lifetime in the model), which can be modified by passage of the transaction through certain blocks. The capabilities of the latter vary from simple to complex.

GPSS automatically prints (and displays in the case of running GPSS on a personal computer [10]) a variety of output statistics from a discrete-event simulation. These pertain primarily to the various facilities, queues and storages in the model.

Thus, from an inspection of the facility output statistics from a GPSS simulation, an analyst might find that the average holding time per transaction for a given facility is considerably greater than the user-supplied average service time for that facility. In an apparel manufacturing application, for example, this could indicate that a sewing machine, after finishing processing of a bundle of parts (transaction), often cannot discharge the bundle because of an unavailable needed facility.

The latter might correspond to a staging area which is full or another work station which is engaged, or a human operator. The regular occurrence of such a situation would normally be accompanied by an average utilization (fraction of total time busy) approaching unity for the original upstream facility, and would suggest the existence of some downstream bottleneck. The existence of similar bottleneck situations can also be deduced from the output statistics for GPSS storages.

The output statistics for queues also represent very valuable information. Thus, high average values for a given queue length and high average waiting times per transaction would again result from some downstream bottleneck in the process being modelled. The model could then be easily and appropriately modified, perhaps by additional or more efficient downstream facilities representing proposed process modifications, as in this present study of apparel manufacturing. The productivity (number of apparel items processed or produced) of the modelled process is, of course, related to the number of transactions passing through the GPSS model.

#### Prior Applications

The literature abounds with example applications of GPSS to materials handling systems and discrete-parts manufacturing facilities. A number of simple examples are given in the textbook by Schriber [6], including the movement of rough castings by an

overhead crane in a foundry, accommodation of oil tankers at a port, and an inventory control system. More complex applications of discrete-event simulation with GPSS - generally the subject of individual journal articles - are modelling of materials handling in the processing of oil-bearing tar sands [11], accumulating and non-accumulating conveyor systems [12], and a fleet [13] of automatic guided vehicles (AGVs).

In recent years discrete-event simulation has become an accepted design tool in chemical and allied processing. There has recently occurred an intense revival of commercial interest in batch processes, such as those employed in the manufacture of specialty chemicals, foods, pharmaceuticals, and agricultural chemicals, in the developed countries of the world. Certainly, one of the primary driving forces for this industry change has been the recent commissioning of many world-scale commodity chemical plants in various developing countries. Thus, recently published batch process applications of GPSS have included polyvinyl chloride (PVC) production [14], penicillin synthesis [15], and manufacture of choline chloride [16] - used as a nutrient in the fortification of animal and poultry feeds, as well as a sequence of multicomponent batch distillation columns [17], as in a solvent recovery operation. A brief summary of these and other process applications of GPSS has recently been published [18], as well as a tutorial article [19] on the subject.

Thus, the objective of the first phase of this project was to develop a validated simulation of a typical size utility trouser manufacturing plant, to serve as a tool for evaluating new technologies and manufacturing methods. Such an application, with its plant input being the output of a textile finishing mill, is a natural extension of the prior work described above. This model, written in the GPSS/PC language, includes all of the major machine operations in an apparel plant, such as cutting, 2-dimensional subassembly and 3-dimensional joining, as well as representing the various labor pools. Such a model also permits ready extension of operating data from a demonstration phase, for example, to a full-scale plant.

#### Utility Trouser Plant Configuration

The facility chosen for simulation and model validation in this work is a large traditional plant manufacturing men's utility denim trousers. It has a nominal production capacity of 40,000 pairs of trousers per week, but has operated at times in excess of 43,000 pairs/week. There are 37 identifiable operations in this process, occurring at 250-300 work stations, all of which require manual attendance. The various joining and assembly operations are performed with either Juki or Singer sewing machines. The plant operates on a single (day) shift for a total of 40 hours/week. Plant input is 62,000 yards of fabric (either 100% cotton or 65-35 polycotton) per week, and at any time it is estimated that there

are 1-2 weeks of production in the plant as WIP inventory.

The material flow configuration for this trouser plant is shown as Figure 1. Associated with this figure is Table I, which identifies the various operations and is organized into segments in the same fashion as the GPSS model (to be discussed later). In addition to identifying the various operations indicated in Figure 1, this table also shows the GPSS name, number of work stations (N), unit processing time (t, minutes/pair) and average processing time ( $t/N$ , minutes) for each operation.

This trouser manufacturing operation begins with the spreading of fabric rolls on large tables (25 yards long). Anywhere from 120 to 200 plies (depending upon the fabric) are spread, prior to cutting of the various parts according to the marker. The individual parts are then labelled and collected into bundles of 40, after which they are carried to their various respective work stations. These above operations comprise the first model segment.

Model segment 2 consists of back pockets fabrication, beginning with hemming and followed by clip-stitching, buttonhole making and creasing. This second segment is then merged into the third segment, representing back panel assembly. This latter segment commences with sewing of labels onto the cut and marked back panels. This is then followed by sewing of darts,

Figure 1  
Material flow configuration  
for trouser manufacturing  
plant






Table I

## Work Stations in Utility Trouser Manufacturing Plant

Station No.	Operation	GPSS Name	No. of Work Stations (N)	Unit Proc. Time (t), <u>min</u> pair	Avg. Proc. Time (t/N), min
Model Segment 1 - - Spreading and Cutting					
1a	Spread fabric roll	SPRED	4	0.1875	0.0469
1b	Cut various pieces	CUTTR	11	0.625	0.0568
1c	Mark cut plies	CODER	14	0.8125	0.0580
Model Segment 2 - Back Pockets					
2a	Hem back pockets	BHEM	3	0.167	0.0557
2b	Clip-stitch back pockets	CLIP	2	0.087	0.0435
2c	Buttonhole back pockets	BHOL	3	0.154	0.0513
2d	Crease back pockets	CRSE	4	0.240	0.0600
(Joined with back panels in 3, FBACK)					
Model Segment 3 - Back Panels					
3a	Sew back label	BLAB	3	0.167	0.0557
3b	Sew darts on back panels	DARTS	4	0.202	0.0505
3c	Topstitch darts	TOPS	4	0.197	0.0493
3d	Sew buttons on back panels	SBTN	3	0.147	0.0490
(Joined with back pockets from 2, FBACK)					
3e	Attach back pockets	ABP	13	0.753	0.0579
(Joined with finished fronts in 6, FBKS)					
Model Segment 4 - Right and Left Flies					
4a	Make zipper	MFLY	1	0.043	0.0430
4b	Set zipper on left fly	LFLY	4	0.197	0.0493
4c	Topstitch fly	TOPF	5	0.274	0.0548
4d	Set zipper on right fly	RFLY	5	0.270	0.0540
(Joined with finished front pockets and panels in 6, FRNT)					

Table I (continued)

Station No.	Operation	GPSS Name	No. of Work Stations (N)	Unit Proc. Time (t), min pair	Avg. Proc. Time (t/N), min
Model Segment 5 – Front Pockets					
5a	Hem front pockets	FHEM	3	0.167	0.0557
5b	Clip-stitch front pockets	STCH	2	0.087	0.0435
5c	Crease front pockets	CRPC	4	0.240	0.0600
(Joined with front panels in 6, FPANL)					
Model Segment 6 – Front Panels and Pockets					
(Joined with front pockets from 5, FPANL)					
6a	Stitch front pockets on panels	FPOC	13	0.753	0.0579
(Joined with finished flies from 4, FRNT)					
6b	Set left fly	SETL	7	0.404	0.0577
6c	Set right fly	SETR	7	0.376	0.0537
(Joined with finished back pockets and panels from 3, FBKS)					
6d	Sew side seams	SEAM	11	0.635	0.0577
6e	Sew seat seam	SEAT	5	0.287	0.0574
(Joined with waist bands in 7, BNDS)					
Model Segment 7 – Waist Bands					
(Joined with finished fronts and backs from 6, BNDS)					
7a	Attach waist bands	AWB	11	0.653	0.0594
7b	Attach button flies to bands	BFLY	3	0.177	0.0590
7c	Close band ends	BEND	13	0.780	0.0600
7d	Set slide stops on zipper	SLDE	7	0.392	0.0560
(Moved to fronts and backs in 8, COMBN)					

Table I (continued)

Station No.	Operation	GPSS Name	No. of Work Stations (N)	Unit Proc. Time (t), <u>min</u> pair	Avg. Proc. Time (t/N), min
Model Segment 8 – Front and Backs					
8a	Join fronts	JOINT	6	0.349	0.0582
8b	Sew inseam	INS	12	0.674	0.0562
8c	Buttonhole waist band	BUTB	4	0.201	0.0503
(Joined with belt loops in 9, FEVRY)					
Model Segment 9 – Belt Loops					
9a	Make belt loops	LUPS	2	0.077	0.0385
(Joined with finished fronts and backs from 8, FEVRY)					
9b	Attach belt loops	ALUP	22	1.293	0.0588
9c	Sew labels on	SLAB	5	0.295	0.0590
9d	Press and fold	FOLD	11	0.619	0.0563
9e	Top press trousers	PRES	5	0.274	0.0548
9f	Inspect and fold	INSP	<u>19</u>	1.097	0.0577
Total no. of work stations			255		

topstitching of the darts and sewing of buttons onto the back panels, before merger with the finished back pockets from the second segment. Segment 3 continues on with attachment of the back pockets to the back panels, before being merged with finished front panels and pockets in model segment 6 (to be discussed later).

Fly making occurs at the beginning of model segment 4. After the initial step of zipper making, the latter is set onto the left fly. After topstitching, the zipper is set onto the right fly, before joining with finished front pockets and panels from segment 6. Front pocket assembly occurs in model segment 5. Here, the cut and marked front pockets are, just as in the case of the back pockets, hemmed, clip-stitched and creased (obviously no buttonhole in this case). Segment 5 concludes with the assembly of the finished front pockets with the cut and marked front panels from segment 6.

The first step in model segment 6 consists of stitching the finished front pockets from segment 5 onto the front panels. After setting of left and right flies from segment 4, the completed front panels join up with completed back panels from segment 3. The sewing of side and seat seams then constitutes the last steps of model segment 6, before moving on to segment 7.

In model segment 7, the cut and marked waist bands are first joined with the finished and assembled back and front panels from the sixth segment. There follows attachment of the waist bands to

the back panels, button fly attachment, closing of the waist band ends and installation of slide stops on the zipper. The finished backs then move on to model segment 8, which consists of joining of the fronts, sewing the inseam and buttonholing the waist band. The nearly finished trousers then move on to the last manufacturing segment (9).

Belt loops are first made in this last segment. The remainder of this latter segment consists of the various finishing operations in this plant. These begin with attachment of the belt loops and sewing on labels, followed by pressing and folding. The last two manufacturing steps are top pressing and then inspection and folding. The finished trouser products are then ready for shipment.

The division of this utility trouser manufacturing facility into the nine segments described above is clearly arbitrary. This particular division was selected so as to facilitate coding of the GPSS model of this plant, as described below. Certainly, other valid divisions of this plant could be conceived, so long as the materials flow configuration remains correct.

#### Preliminary Modeling Considerations

This model of a trouser plant was coded with the Industrial Version (as opposed to the Student Version) of GPSS/PC, supplied by Minuteman Software of Stow, Massachusetts. The various

simulations were run on an IBM PS/2, Model 50 PC with 1000K of RAM (core memory). In principle, this Version of GPSS/PC can be run on any IBM-compatible PC with only 320K of core memory, but considerably longer run times result (most of the simulations reported in this work ran for less than 10 minutes). More significantly, however, a lower core memory availability would gravely exacerbate the transaction storage problems encountered in this work and discussed below.

One of the first decisions to be made in any GPSS simulation pertains to the size of the transactions passing through the model. A transaction size of one production unit, i.e., one pair of trousers, would be ludicrously small in modelling of a plant producing 40,000 pairs of trouser per week, and in which there are 1-2 weeks of WIP inventory. It was originally hoped to define a transaction size as 40 pairs or parts (the various incomplete parts must also be represented as separate transactions) in this model, corresponding to the bundle size employed in this particular plant. It was found, however, that with the slightest imbalance in the model, e.g., as a result of overfeeding from the spreading and cutting operations, computer core memory was rapidly exhausted as the simulation proceeded. Specifically, with the 1000K PC, core memory became depleted whenever the total number of transactions in the model exceeded approximately 1500. This problem is not inherent with GPSS/PC. The same difficulty was encountered in the earlier GPSS simulation of a textile finishing mill [3], which was

run on a Control Data Corporation Cyber 855 mainframe computer. Hence, the transaction size in this present work was increased to 160, corresponding to four bundles, which was found to be satisfactory in all of the simulations. This value also corresponds to the average number of plies spread and cut in one such operation in this plant.

Having defined the transaction size, it remained to decide upon the elementary time unit for the simulations. This quantity must be an integer, representing the smallest value into which any processing time can be divided. Table I shows that the unit processing times for each operation are in minutes/pair, to three or four decimal places. It was thus decided to employ 0.01 minute as the elementary time step in these GPSS simulations. That is, 100 time units in the simulation corresponded to one minute of real plant operation. With this decision and the prior definition of one transaction as representing 160 identical parts or pairs, the various unit processing times in Table I were all multiplied by  $100 \times 160 = 16,000$  for model coding purposes. Thus, for example, the unit processing time of 0.167 minute for hemming of back pockets became equal to 2672 GPSS time units in the model.

All GPSS simulations begin from a cold start; that is, initially (time = 0) there are no transactions at all (either in the various work stations or in the upstream queues) in the model. This situation may be appropriate in some cases, but certainly not

in this present instance, where WIP inventory is typically left in place at the end of each working day or shift. Thus, it often becomes necessary in GPSS simulations to first run the model for a brief startup period, and then clear all of the output statistics and reset the clock back to zero, before running the model again. The objective here is to start the simulation from a representative steady-state initial condition (known as a hot start). This procedure is easily implemented in GPSS/PC; the startup period, needed to fill up the subject model with transactions at various locations, is typically much less than the duration of the simulation from a hot start. Based upon the prior estimate of 1-2 weeks of production in this plant as WIP inventory, the duration of the startup period in this work was selected as two weeks. Simulations were then run for four weeks or more of plant time after this startup period, in order to obtain representative statistical output.

#### Utility Trouser Plant Model

This GPSS model of a utility trouser plant closely follows the configuration summarized in Figure 1 and Table I. Thus in model segment 1, depicted in Figure 2, the starting GENERATE block supplies enough rolled fabric for 160 pairs of trousers or one transaction. The first (and only) operand or argument of this block represents the interarrival time between successive batches of feed fabric to the initial spreading operation, and thus regulates the feed rate to this plant. For example, at a nominal



### Spreading, cutting, and labelling

## MODEL SEGMENT 1



(balanced) production rate of 40,000 pairs/week or 16.7 pairs/min, this interarrival time between successive transactions (of 160 pairs each) would be 9.6 minutes or 960 GPSS time units. Values less than the latter value for this operand would correspond to overfeeding of this plant, and larger values to underfeeding.

Each new transaction from the GENERATE block then attempts to engage one of the four spreading work stations (ENTER SPRED), after successful completion of which it passes on to the cutting and ply marking operations. There then follows a series of six SPLIT blocks, each of which creates a daughter transaction representing cut parts (back pockets, front panels, waist bands, etc) to be sent off to their respective work stations in other model segments. After execution of these SPLIT blocks, the parent transaction is unconditionally transferred to the last manufacturing segment (9, belt loops) in this model.

In Figure 2, there is twice observed the occurrence of the following sequence of blocks:

QUEUE

ENTER

DEPART

ADVANCE

LEAVE

These two sequences in Figure 2 specifically pertain to the cutting and ply marking operations, respectively. The QUEUE block and its inverse (DEPART block) are needed here to collect queuing or waiting time statistics from the simulation. A similar sequence of these five blocks is also needed for each of the other 34 operations in this plant. Thus, for purposes of brevity in presentation, it became convenient to define a conceptual macro block, denoted by QEDAL (from the first letter of each of the above five blocks), representing this sequence. This definition is illustrated in Figure 3, showing the compression of this sequence into one QEDAL macro block, as it appears in succeeding model segments. The convention most often adopted here was to restrict the GPSS name of a given work station to four alphabetic characters, and to denote the associated upstream queue by the same four letters prefixed by the letter Q. Thus, in model segment 2, for example, one has BHEM and QBHEM, respectively.

Each of the succeeding seven manufacturing segments begins with an ADVANCE block, labelled in accordance with the segment function. An operand for these ADVANCE blocks could be used to simulate the transportation time lag to deliver one transaction (or 160 parts) to the first work station in each segment. Such time lags were not incorporated into this model, inasmuch as no plant data were available on this subject. Model segment 2 in Figure 4 thus commences with an ADVANCE block labelled BPOCS, which is then succeeded by four QEDAL sequences corresponding to the four work

Figure 3: Definition of conceptual QEDAL macro block representing the sequence:  
 QUEUE - ENTER - DEPART - ADVANCE - LEAVE blocks

# QEDAL SEQUENCE


QUEUE

ENTER

DEPART

ADVANCE

LEAVE



## MODEL SEGMENT 2




Figure 4  
GPSS Model Segment 2  
Back pockets


station operations in this segment (see Table I).

In addition to queuing statistics for each work station, it was also desired to collect such statistics from these simulations on any time that finished or partly finished parts spent waiting to be joined with other parts. Thus, before any such joining or matching operation, each transaction was routed through a QUEUE block for this purpose. The corresponding DEPART block, denoting exit from the waiting line, was executed only after all necessary parts had been collected before moving onto the next work station. Thus, in model segment 2, for example, a QUEUE block named QBPOC is placed immediately after the four work stations. The transaction is then transferred unconditionally to model segment 3 (FBACK) to be joined with a matching transaction therein.

Model segment 3 in Figure 5 begins with the ADVANCE block labelled FBACK, followed also by four QEDAL sequences representing the work stations in this segment. A leaving transaction (denoting 160 pairs of partially finished back panels in this case) then moves into the QUEUE block named QBPAN, whose function is to collect statistics on any time that these partially finished back panels spend waiting for finished back pockets (from model segment 2). The following ASSEMBLE block then joins a transaction of partially finished back panels with a transaction of finished back pockets. The latter transaction is destroyed in this joining process, and thus the total transaction count resident in the model

# **MODEL SEGMENT 3**

Figure 5  
GPSS Model Segment 3  
Back panels



is reduced. Model segment 3 then concludes with attachment of back pockets (again denoted by a QEDAL sequence), before unconditional transfer to model segment 6 (front panels and pockets).

The four work station operations comprising fly making constitute model segment 4 in Figure 6. The finished flies then join with finished front panels from model segment 6. Similarly, model segment 5 consists of the three work stations employed to form front pockets, before being merged into model segment 6.

This latter segment (see Figure 7) really begins with the merger (FPANL) of cut front panels and finished front pockets. After stitching of the latter onto the former, the merger with finished flies (FRNT) occurs. Model segment 6 then continues with the two fly setting operations, before merging again -- this time with finished back panels and pockets from segment 3. The surviving transactions of model segment 6 continue on through the last two sewing operations of this segment, before being merged into the waist band segment (BNDS).

In model segment 7, shown in Figure 8, waist bands directly from the ply marking step collect finished front and back panels from segment 6, before proceeding through the four work stations associated with waist band attachment. These transactions then move on directly to model segment 8 and its joining operations, before transferring unconditionally to the last manufacturing segment.



Figure 6: GPSS Model Segment 4 (Right and left flies)

GPSS Model Segment 5 (Front pockets)

## MODEL SEGMENT 4

## MODEL SEGMENT 5




Figure 6

GPSS Model Segment 6

# **MODEL SEGMENT 6**

Front panels and pockets (FRNT)





Figure 8: GPSS Model Segment 7 (Waist bands)  
 GPSS Model Segment 8 (Fronts and backs)

## MODEL SEGMENT 7

## MODEL SEGMENT 8




Belt loops are first made in model segment 9, shown in Figure 9. These then merge with the joined fronts and backs from segment 8. The various finishing operations (e.g., pressing, inspection, folding) then conclude model segment 9. After leaving the last inspection station, transactions (here representing finished pairs of trousers) first pass through a TABULATE block named JIT, wherein the total manufacturing time for each transaction is tallied. A transaction then exits the model through the TERMINATE block ending model segment 9. A count of the total number of transactions passing through this last block gives the total production over the duration of a simulation.

Also shown in Figure 9 is the timer for regulating the duration of a simulation -- model segment 10. It consists simply of a GENERATE block followed by a TERMINATE block. The value of the (first and only) operand for this GENERATE block is set equal to 48,000, which is the number of GPSS time units (0.01 minute) in one 8-hr day of operation. The duration of a startup period or of a succeeding simulation was then regulated by the integer value of the A operand in the START control statement for each run. Thus, a value of 10 for this START operand would set the duration of a startup period or production simulation to be 10 days.

The complete GPSS coding for this discrete-event simulation model of an operating utility trouser manufacturing plant is provided in Appendix A.

## MODEL SEGMENT 9

## MODEL SEGMENT 10



## Simulation Results from Utility Trouser Plant Model


As noted earlier, the nominal production capacity of the subject plant is 40,000 pairs of trousers per week. Hence, on the basis of 40 operating hours per week, the maximum average time that can be allotted to the manufacture of any one part for a pair of trousers is 0.06 minute. This plant model was thus configured (e.g., number of individual work stations) so that the average processing time for each operation was no greater than this value. This average processing time was obtained by dividing the actual processing time, as obtained from typical trouser assembly operations, by the number of work stations assigned to the given operation. Table I shows that the average processing time for several of these operations (creasing back pockets, creasing front pockets, closing waist band ends) is exactly equal to 0.06 minute, with the number of such work stations selected. These particular operations then become the limiting steps or bottlenecks to increased production. That is, if this plant were to be overfed (as in some of our simulations), production would remain limited to 40,000 pairs per week and unsteady-state conditions would develop. Specifically, WIP inventory (of all sorts) would increase monotonically with production time and the plant would become saturated. In the context of this GPSS model, transactions would continue to accumulate therein until core memory was exhausted. The only way to alleviate this overfeeding problem would be through reallocation and/or addition of resources (work stations), if unit

processing times could not be reduced.

Figure 10 shows simulation results corresponding to both underfeeding and overfeeding cases. The feed rate of fabric, plotted as the abscissa therein, was adjusted by varying the value of the operand for the GENERATE block in model segment 1, as discussed earlier. These results show the production rate increasing linearly and exactly (45° line) with the plant feed rate, up to its nominal limiting capacity of 40,000 pairs per week. Beyond this point, production remains flat at this value for the case of overfeeding. As mentioned earlier, the production rate in these simulations is determined from the number of transactions leaving the TERMINATE block in model segment 9. The total number of work stations (255, from Table I) required to achieve this nominal production level is within the range of 250-300, as provided by plant management.

The inventory (both of pairs and total parts) curves of Figure 10 are of considerable interest. Thus, both inventory figures increase slowly with feed rate until the limiting capacity of 40,000 pairs/week is reached. Thereafter, both of these figures begin to increase more dramatically, the sum of the individual parts more so than the pairs. This behavior clearly indicates the onset of plant saturation. Indeed, it must be emphasized that all of these simulation results in Figure 10 are for a 4-week production period, after a 2-week startup period. Clearly both inventory figures, at a given plant feed rate, would increase

Production and WIP inventories as functions of plant feed rate





(decrease) if a longer (shorter) production simulation period were chosen (because of the unsteady-state conditions at overfeeding).

The total WIP inventory of parts (both at work stations and in queues) in Figure 10 is easily determined from the total transaction count in the model -- part of the standard GPSS/PC output -- at the conclusion of a simulation. The total number of unfinished pairs of trousers in this plant must be determined in a different fashion, however. This quantity is determined by summing up all of the transactions along one of the various manufacturing routes (including both work stations and queues) in the plant. Table II shows the four longest such routes in this particular plant.

Specifically, Figure 10 shows that the total number of unfinished trousers in inventory at the end of four weeks of overfeeding as exceeding 50,000, and the total number of parts as approaching 140,000. These results clearly bracket the plant management estimate of 77,000 for its WIP inventory.

Table II also gives the total unit processing times ( $\Sigma t$ , minutes/pair) along each of the manufacturing routes therein. In this case, the largest such total, of 11.378 minutes/pair, is seen to occur along Route No. 1. The physical significance of this value corresponds to the minimum possible time it would take to manufacture one pair of trousers in this specific plant (sometimes referred to as residence time). Realistically, however, this number would have to be multiplied by an integer representing the

Table II  
Production Routes in the Manufacture of Utility Trousers

Operations	Unit Proc. Times ( $\sum t$ ), min/pair
Route No. 1	
1a - 1c	1.625
5a - 5c	0.494
6a - 6e	2.455
7a - 7d	2.002
8a - 8c	1.224
9b - 9f	<u>3.578</u>
Total	11.378
Route No. 2	
1a - 1c	1.625
4a - 4d	0.784
6b - 6e	1.702
7a - 7d	2.002
8a - 8c	1.224
9b - 9f	<u>3.578</u>
Total	10.915
Route No. 3	
1a - 1c	1.625
3a - 3e	1.466
6d - 6e	0.922
7a - 7d	2.002
8a - 8c	1.224
9b - 9f	<u>3.578</u>
Total	10.817
Route No. 4	
1a - 1c	1.625
2a - 2d	0.648
3e	0.753
6d - 6e	0.922
7a - 7d	2.002
4g - 4i	1.224
8b - 8f	<u>3.578</u>
Total	10.752

number of pairs cut in the initial operation or, downstream thereof, the bundle size. Thus, a bundle size of 40 pairs would incur a residence time in excess of 450 minutes or almost one day of operation. Similarly, the residence time for a transaction size of 160 pairs would be 1800+ minutes, or almost four days. It is also clear from a comparison of Figure 1 and Table II that not all of the possible manufacturing paths have been included in the latter. Thus, several routes, for example, through waist bands or belt loops, have been excluded. Mere inspection of the materials flow configuration in Figure 1 and of the processing times in Table I clearly shows that neither of these routes could contribute to the unit residence time.

As described earlier, the function of the TABULATE block in model segment 9 of Figure 9 is to collect statistics on the total time transactions spend in the model. These output statistics are summarized in Table III -- showing both the mean values and standard deviations for these residence times. In the cases of underfeeding and balanced operation, these results show the residence time per pair of trousers to be exactly equal, as expected, to the value of 11.378 minutes computed in Table II. That is, even when the plant is underfed, there is no way in which the minimum time required to produce one pair of trousers in this plant can be less than this value (without any reallocation of resources). Similarly, in the absence of overfeeding, the standard deviation in this residence time is equal to zero. As the plant

Table III

Manufacturing Residence Times as Functions of the Plant Feed Rate

Plant Feed Rate, <u>pairs</u> <u>week</u>	Residence Time, <u>min</u> <u>pair</u>	Standard Deviation, <u>min</u> <u>pair</u>
Underfeeding		
36,920	11.378	0.0
38,400	11.378	0.0
Balanced Operation		
40,000	11.378	0.0
Overfeeding		
41,740	13.404	0.722
43,640	15.431	1.444

is overfed, however, both the manufacturing residence time and the standard deviation begin to increase (the latter from its previous value of zero). These figures thus indicate the onset of inventory backup in the plant. Again, because of the unsteady-state conditions prevalent at overfeeding, both of these figures would increase monotonically if longer production times (greater than four weeks) were simulated.

Appendix B supplies the actual output from this GPSS model of the utility trouser plant operating in balanced fashion at its nominal production capacity of 40,000 pairs/week.

It was indicated earlier in the discussion of the GPSS processor that a variety of output statistics are automatically printed out at the conclusion of a simulation. Thus, Table IV shows the simulation results for the most utilized work stations (fraction of total time busy) in this plant at balanced production conditions. There are 15 such work stations shown therein, all with a fractional utilization greater than 95%. Also shown in Table IV are the average processing times ( $t/N$ , from Table I) for each of these 15 stations, all of which are either equal or close to the limiting value of 0.06 minute/pair. Indeed, for this rather simple application with no randomness or stochasticism incorporated, these fractional utilizations are all equal to the respective unit processing times divided by the limiting value of 0.06, as expected from queuing theory.

Table IV

Most Utilized Work Stations at a Balanced Production Level  
(40,000 pairs/week or 0.06 min/pair)

Station No.	Operation	Avg. Proc. Time (t/N), min	Fractional Utilization
2d	Crease back pockets	0.0600	1.000
5c	Crease front pockets	0.0600	1.000
7c	Close band ends	0.0600	1.000
7a	Attach waist bands	0.0594	0.989
7b	Attach button flies to bands	0.0590	0.983
9c	Sew labels on	0.0590	0.983
9b	Attach belt loops	0.0588	0.980
8a	Join fronts	0.0582	0.969
1c	Mark cut plies	0.0580	0.967
3e	Attach back pockets	0.0579	0.965
6a	Stitch front pockets on panels	0.0579	0.965
9f	Inspect and fold	0.0577	0.962
6d	Sew side seams	0.0577	0.962
6b	Set left fly	0.0577	0.962
6e	Sew seat seam	0.0574	0.957

Lastly, in Table V are presented selected simulation results on the most crowded manufacturing queues in this plant, again at a balanced production level of 40,000 pairs per week. These results agree closely with expectations from Table II. That is, the most crowded queues and, correspondingly, the longest waiting times occur along routes which do not contribute to the total residence time in this plant. Specifically, these queues all develop at points immediately upstream of assembly operations. Thus, Table V shows that the largest queue (QBL) consists of belt loops waiting to be merged with finished backs and fronts, then waist bands (QBNDS) to be merged with finished backs and fronts, and so on. With the onset of overfeeding, all of these queues in Table V grow both in length and waiting time, and there also appears the development of new additional queues at various points in the plant.

#### Hi-Tech Trouser Plant Configuration

The hypothetical, high-technology facility chosen for investigation in this work corresponds, in its material flow configuration, to that at the Advanced Apparel Manufacturing Technology Demonstration (AAMTD) Center, located on the campus of the Southern College of Technology (SCOT) in Marietta, Georgia. This configuration was then scaled up to a nominal production level of 8,000 pairs of trousers per (8-hr) day. There are 33 identifiable operations (including cutting, sewing and matching) in this hypothetical facility, occurring at a total of 182 work

Table V

Most Crowded Queues at a Balanced Production Level (40,000 pairs/week)

Queue Name	Downstream Operation	Maximum Contents, pieces	Ave. Wait. Time, min/piece
QBL	Assemble belt loops and finished backs/fronts	16,320	5.534
QBND	Assemble waist bands and finished backs/fronts	8,000	2.811
QBCK	Assemble finished fronts and backs	1,600	0.556
QFPAN	Assemble front panels and pockets	1,440	0.490
QFLYS	Assemble flies and front panels	1,280	0.460
QBPOC	Assemble back pockets and back panels	320	0.065



stations. By way of comparison, the total number of such stations required for the same production rate, but with older technology, in the operating utility trouser plant simulated earlier amounted to 255.

The material flow configuration for this hypothetical trouser plant is shown in Figure 11. Associated with this figure is Table VI, which identifies the various operations and is organized into segments in the same fashion as the GPSS model (to be discussed later). In addition to identifying the various operations indicated in Figure 11, this table also shows the GPSS name, number of work stations ( $N$ ), unit processing time ( $t$ , minutes/pair) and average processing time ( $t/N$ , minutes) for each operation. The unit processing time ( $t$ ) actually served as the mean value ( $\bar{t}$ ) in a normal distribution representing stochastic behavior of a given operation. The standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) in this distribution was then generally taken as some percentage (e.g., 15%) of this mean value.

The trouser manufacturing operation begins with the spreading of fabric rolls on a cutting table. Typically, 30 to 40 plies are spread in the operation at the AAMTD Center. An automated cutting machine (e.g., Gerber) then cuts the various parts, after which they are bundled (typically 60 to a bundle) and sent to various work stations. These operations comprise the first model segment (A).

Spreading &  
Cutting

Figure 11  
Material flow configuration  
for high-technology trouser  
manufacturing plant




Table VI

Work Stations in Hi-Tech Trouser  
Manufacturing Plant

<u>Station ID</u>	<u>Operation</u>	<u>GPSS Name</u>	<u>No. of Work Stations (N)</u>	<u>Standard Unit Proc. Time (t), min/pair</u>	<u>Avg. Proc. Time (t/N), min</u>
Model Segment A -- Spreading and Cutting					
A29	Spread fabric roll	SPRED	3	0.1285	0.0429
A30	Cut various pieces	CUTTR	4	0.1714	0.0429
A31	Bundle cut pieces	CODER	5	0.2143	0.0429
Model Segment B -- Back Pockets					
B3	Hem back pockets	BHEM	4	0.206	0.0515
B4	Buttonhole back pockets	BHOL	2	0.100	0.0500
(Joined with back panels in C, FBACK)					
Model Segment C -- Back Panels					
(Joined with back pockets from B, FBACK)					
C32	Match back parts	MBKS	1	0.040	0.0400
C8	Make back darts	DARTS	4	0.208	0.0520
C9	Topstitch back darts	TOPS	4	0.197	0.04925
C10	Attach back label	BLAB	3	0.167	0.0556
C11	Attach back pockets	ABP	8	0.480	0.0600
C12	Sew seat seam	SEAM	5	0.282	0.0564
(Joined with all other parts in G, FEVRY)					

Table VI (continued)

## Model Segment D -- Right and Left Flies

D5	Make left fly	LFLY	1	0.055	0.0550
D6	Make right fly	RFLY	5	0.300	0.0600
D7	Join flies	JOINT	5	0.300	0.0600
(Joined with front panels and pockets in F, FPANL)					

## Model Segment E -- Front Pockets

E2	Hem front pockets	FHEM	4	0.204	0.0510
(Joined with front panels and flies in F, FPANL)					

## Model Segment F -- Front Panels

F33	Match front parts	MFTS	1	0.040	0.0400
F13	Attach front pockets	AFP	8	0.480	0.0600
F14	Attach left fly	AFLY	7	0.404	0.0577
F15	Topstitch left fly	TFLY	5	0.274	0.0548
F16	Join fronts	FINF	6	0.349	0.0582
(Joined with all other parts in G, FEVRY)					

## Model Segment G -- Belt Loops

G1	Make belt loops	LUPS	2	0.077	0.0385
(Joined with all other parts from A, C and F, FEVRY)					
G17	Match all parts	MFBS	1	0.040	0.0400
G18	Load UPS	UPS	2	0.100	0.0500
G19	Sew side seam	SIDE	11	0.635	0.0577

Table VI (continued)

## Model Segment H -- Finished Trousers

H20	Sew inseam	INS	12	0.674	0.0562
H21	Attach waistband	AWB	8	0.437	0.0546
H22	Finish band ends	BEND	8	0.434	0.05425
H23	Buttonhole band	BUTN	3	0.131	0.0437
H24	Attach belt loops	ABL	10	0.596	0.0596
H25	Tack fly, sew label	TACK	5	0.295	0.0590
H26	Press and fold	FOLD	11	0.619	0.0563
H27	Top press	PRES	5	0.274	0.0548
H28	Inspect	SPEC	<u>19</u>	1.097	0.0577
Total no. of work stations			182		

Back pockets fabrication, consisting of the operations of hemming and buttonholing, occurs in model segment B. These finished parts are then matched with back panels in model segment C. This is followed by the various sewing operations associated with back panels fabrication: sewing and topstitching back darts, attaching the back label and back pockets, and seat seaming.

Model segment D consists of fly assembly. Left flies are first made, then right flies, following by joining of these two. The finished flies then move on to match with front panels and front pockets in model segment F. The front panels move directly from spreading and cutting to this matching operation, while the front pockets arrive via the short model segment E, consisting of the sole operation of hemming front pockets.

Thus, the sixth model segment (F) begins with matching of finished flies, front pockets and panels. The front pockets are then attached to the front panels, followed by attachment and topstitching of the left fly. This model segment concludes with joining of the front panels.

Model segment G begins with the making of belt loops, followed by matching of the various partially finished parts (fronts, backs and waist bands, in addition to belt loops). As described above, the backs come from segment B and the fronts from segment F. The waist bands arrive directly from the spreading and cutting

operations. After this matching operation, the UPS is loaded and sideseams are stitched.

The above model segment G then flows naturally into the last manufacturing segment (H) in this hypothetical plant. Here, the various finishing operations associated with trouser manufacture are performed. In order, these are inseam stitching, attachment of waist bands, finishing the band ends, buttonholing and buttonsewing, attachment of the belt loops, tacking the fly and label sewing, and inspection and unloading of the UPS. Any repairs, if necessary, are performed at this point.

The above described division of this hypothetical trouser plant into the eight indicated segments is clearly somewhat arbitrary. It seems to be a reasonably natural division, and was implemented in order to facilitate coding of the GPSS model of this plant, as described below.

#### Hi-Tech Trouser Plant Model

As with the utility trouser model presented earlier, this present model was coded with the Industrial Version of GPSS/PC [10], supplied by Minuteman Software of Stow, Massachusetts. Similarly, all of the present simulations were run on an IBM PS/2, Model 50 PC with 1000K of RAM (core memory).

The final size of a GPSS transaction selected in this hi-tech plant model corresponded to 120 pairs of trousers (or parts thereof), which nominally represents two bundles in the subject hi-tech plant. Memory depletion rapidly occurred with smaller transaction sizes (e.g., 60), when simulating unbalanced conditions. Similar problems relating to the minimum size of a transaction in textile [3] and apparel applications have been addressed and discussed earlier. The elementary time step selected in these present GPSS simulations was 0.01 minute; that is, one minute of real plant operation corresponds to 100 time units in a simulation. Given the transaction size selected above, all of the various unit processing times in Table VI were then multiplied by  $120 \times 100 = 12,000$  for representation in the model.

Since all GPSS simulations begin from a cold start (no transactions anywhere present in the model), a startup period is necessary to place transactions in the model, representing normal steady-state operating conditions. A 2-week startup period was typically employed in this present work.

This GPSS model naturally follows the material flow configuration given in Figure 11 (and Table VI). Thus, the spreading, cutting and bundling operations of model segment A are coded as shown in Figure 12. The various cut parts generated by the SPLIT blocks following these operations are sent off to their respective work stations or matching locations.




Figure 12

GPSS Model Segment A

# **MODEL SEGMENT A**

Spreading, Cutting Bundling



The A (or first) operand of the GENERATE block commencing model segment A regulates the input rate of transactions to the GPSS model. Specifically, this operand specifies the interarrival time (in GPSS time units) between successive transactions to the model. Thus, for the subject plant producing 8,000 pairs of trousers (or  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  transactions) per 8-hr day, the average interarrival time between transactions should amount to 7.2 minutes or 720 GPSS time units. Such would be the case for a perfectly balanced plant, with no stochasticism, producing 8,000 pairs/day. In some of the production scenarios explored later (e.g., more efficient equipment), however, there is the possibility of a larger production rate. Thus, as shown in Figure 12, this A operand was reduced to a value of 685, which represents a small amount of fabric overfeeding, to accommodate this possibility. This operand value would specifically correspond to a production rate of 8,409 pairs/day.

As mentioned earlier, stochasticism in this study was implemented with the normal distribution, represented by a mean and standard deviation for each operation. For this purpose, a generic normal distribution function, with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of unity, was defined. For a given operation then, a value of this function, as sampled with the aid of a random number generator, was multiplied by the actual standard deviation and added to the actual mean to yield a processing time. This latter

arithmetic was performed with the aid of a global arithmetic variable named SERVE. The appropriate values of the mean and standard deviation for each operation (numbered from 1 to 33, as in Table VI) were then supplied from two generic functions (actually table lookups), named MEAN and SDEV, respectively.

Thus, the purpose of the ASSIGN blocks appearing in Figure 12 is to supply the transaction parameter number (4 in these simulations) and operation number, in order to look up the appropriate values of the mean and standard deviation for a given operation. In the latter two operations (cutting and bundling) in this figure, the ASSIGN block occurs within the following sequence of GPSS blocks: QUEUE-ENTER-DEPART-ASSIGN-ADVANCE-LEAVE. Since this 6-block sequence will occur again for each of the remaining 30 operations in this trouser plant, it becomes convenient to define a conceptual macro block, denoted by QEDAAL, to represent this sequence. Figure 13 illustrates this definition pictorially.

The GPSS block diagram then moves on to model segment B (back pockets), beginning with the ADVANCE block labelled BPOCS, as shown in Figure 14. After proceeding through the two work stations (denoted by the QEDAAL macros) in this segment, transactions (here representing 120 sets of finished back pockets) move into model segment C (back panels, also shown in Figure 14) at the ASSEMBLE block labelled FBACK. After this assembly operation and departure from the respective queues (QBPOC and QBPAN), the five operations

# QEDAAL SEQUENCE

QUEUE

ENTER

DEPART


ASSIGN

ADVANCE

LEAVE

Figure 13

Definition of conceptual  
QEDAAL macro block for  
operation n, representin  
the sequence of QUEUE-  
ENTER-DEPART-ASSIGN-  
ADVANCE-LEAVE, blocks



# MODEL SEGMENT B

# MODEL SEGMENT C




Figure 14

GPSS Model Segment B back pocket

GPSS Model Segment C back panel


(C8 through C12) of the back panels segment are performed. The finished and assembled back panels with pockets are then transferred unconditionally to the ASSEMBLE point (FEVRY) upstream of the UPS loading station in segment G. Model segment C also begins with an ADVANCE block, labelled BPANS, to which the cut back panels are sent (from segment A).

The block diagrams for the short model segments D and E are both shown in Figure 15. The three operations (D5-D7) comprising fly making constitute the first of these segments while the sole operation (E2) of hemming front pockets makes up the second. Both of these model segments conclude with an unconditional transfer to the assemble point (FPANL) for front parts in segment F, as described below.

The cut front panels are sent directly (from segment A) to model segment F, shown in Figure 16. Having collected the finished front pockets and flies at the assemble point FPANL, the transactions (here representing 120 sets of finished front parts) after matching move on through the four work stations (F13-F16) in this segment. The transactions from this segment are then also transferred to the major assembly point FEVRY.

Model segment G commences with the ADVANCE block labelled BLUPS, as shown in Figure 17. After fabrication of belt loops (step G1), the transactions then pick up all of the other parts,

## MODEL SEGMENT D



## MODEL SEGMENT E




Figure 15

GPSS Model Segment D right & left flies

GPSS Model Segment E front pockets

Figure 16

GPSS Model Segment F  
Front panels  
(FPANs)

## MODEL SEGMENT F







Figure 17

GPSS Model Segment G **MODEL SEGMENT G**

Belt loops




including cut waist bands directly from segment A, at the FEVRY ASSEMBLE block. After matching and loading the UPS, segment G concludes with the side seam sewing operation (G19) before flowing naturally into model segment H, the block diagram for which is shown in Figure 18. This latter segment is quite straightforward, consisting of the nine operations (H20-H28) concluding this trouser manufacturing operation. The TABULATE block following the last QEDAAL work station (inspection) in this segment tallies the total manufacturing residence time for each transaction and stores this information in a table labelled JIT. Similarly, a count of the total number of transactions executing the TERMINATE block ending model segment H gives the total production over the duration of a simulation.

Also shown in Figure 18 is the timer for regulating the duration of a simulation -- model segment I. It consists simply of a GENERATE block followed by a TERMINATE block. The value of the (first and only) operand for this GENERATE block is set equal to 48,000, which is the number of GPSS time units (0.01 minute) in one 8-hr day of operation. The duration of a startup period or of a succeeding simulation was then regulated by the integer value of the A operand in the START control statement for each run. Thus, a value of 10 for this START operand would set the duration of a startup period or production simulation to be 10 days.

Before moving on to the simulation results, it should be mentioned that the sole function of the queues constructed upstream of each set of identical work stations is to collect waiting line

## MODEL SEGMENT H



## MODEL SEGMENT I




Figure 18  
 GPSS Model Segment H  
 Finished trousers  
 GPSS Model Segment I  
 Timer

statistics, such as average queue length and waiting time per transaction. These queues are represented by the QUEUE and DEPART pairs of blocks in the QEDAAL macros appearing in the various manufacturing segments. These pairs of blocks (performing inverse functions) are not essential to the model, and could be discarded wherever the accumulation of waiting line statistics was not of interest.

The complete GPSS coding for this discrete-event simulation model of a hi-tech trouser manufacturing facility is given in Appendix C.

#### Simulation Results from Hi-Tech Trouser Plant Model

Before simulation of the various production scenarios could begin in earnest, it was necessary to establish the startup procedure for this trouser plant and model thereof. This fixing of a consistent startup procedure is particularly important, insofar as stochasticism is incorporated into this model. Thus, it was first established that one week (five 8-hr days or 240,000 GPSS time units) was a sufficiently long startup period in the absence of stochasticism. That is, by this time the plant had become filled up to its normal steady-state inventory and its nominal production capacity of 8,000 pairs per day had been achieved. This latter figure corresponds to a maximum average processing time ( $t/N$ ) of 0.060 minute/pair for any given operation, such as exhibited by several work stations (attach back pockets, make right fly, join flies, attach front pockets) in Table VI.

A longer startup period was invoked when stochasticism was introduced, in order to produce simulation results under comparable conditions. Specifically, in the exploration of all of the various production scenarios in this work, the GPSS model was first run for a 2-week startup period. All of the output statistics at this point were then cleared, the clock reset back to zero, and the model then run for a certain period of time in order to obtain representative and comparable output statistics.

A number of production scenarios were investigated in this work. In general, these corresponded to worker absenteeism, new employee training and the introduction of more efficient equipment. Effects measured then included production rate, work-in-process inventory and manufacturing residence time. The average value of the latter (in minutes/pair) for a given scenario is obtained from the output for the JIT table, fed by the TABULATE block in model segment H. The minimum value of this residence time is easily determined from consideration of the material flow configuration of Figure 11 and unit processing times in Table VI. This analysis, summarized in Table VII, shows that the longest manufacturing route in this hypothetical plant begins, naturally, with spreading and cutting, and then proceeds through fly fabrication and fronts assembly, before carrying on through such finishing operations as pressing and inspection. Specifically, the sojourn along this route amounts to 8.0482 minutes, as computed in Table VII, and physically represents the minimum possible time it would take to

Table VII

## Critical Manufacturing Route in the Production of Trousers

<u>Operations (from Fig. 1)</u>	<u>Unit Proc. Times (<math>\Sigma</math>), min/pair</u>
A29-A31	0.5142
D5-D7	0.655
F33, F13-16	1.547
G17-G19	0.775
H20-H28	<u>4.557</u>
Total	8.0482

manufacture one pair of trousers in this specific plant.

The actual impact of stochasticism on production rate from this trouser plant is illustrated in Figure 19. In these simulations, the total production, after the 2-week startup period, over a following 2-week period was averaged over these latter ten days to get a daily production rate. The standard deviation for each of the 33 operations in this plant was varied from 0 (no stochasticism) to 20% of the mean value. Firstly, one sees from Figure 19 that the presence of stochasticism has, as one would expect, a deleterious effect on the production rate. Probably because of the large size (33 operations) of this facility, however, this production decrease is quite small, amounting to only 1.5% or about 120 pairs/day when the standard deviation rises to 20%. There is somewhat of a greater effect, however, on the average manufacturing residence time, plotted as the right ordinate in Figure 19. This time is seen to increase from 10.57 minutes per pair (significance of this discussed below) for a nonrandom system ( $\sigma = 0$ ) to 12.27 minutes/pair with 20% stochasticism. Appendix D provides sample output from this GPSS model of a hi-tech plant for the (base) case of 15% stochasticism.

The above results are also shown in Table VIII, wherein the work-in-process (WIP) inventory figures are included. Both numbers of pairs and of parts (or pieces for each pair) are given in this table. As with the manufacturing residence time, both of these

Effect of stochasticism in the individual unit operations on trouser production rate




Figure 19



Table VIII

## Summary of Effects of Stochasticism on Trouser Production and Inventory

Amount of Stochasticism (std. devn./mean)	Average Production Rate, <u>pairs/day</u>	Average Residence Time, <u>min/pair</u>	Work-in-Process Inventory:	
			<u>pairs</u>	<u>parts</u>
0.00*	7,998	8.05	16,080	26,280
0.00	8,004	10.57	24,420	58,800
0.05	7,992	11.05	25,320	62,160
0.10	7,968	11.47	26,280	61,800
0.15	7,944	11.61	26,640	63,360
0.20	7,872	12.27	27,960	66,720

\*This run corresponds to a perfectly balanced plant with no stochasticism; the remainder of the runs are with a small amount of overfeeding.

inventory figures generally rise monotonically as more randomness is introduced into the plant's operations. These two quantities are readily determined from appropriate counts of transactions resident in the model at the conclusion of a simulation. Also shown in Table VIII are the results of simulation of a perfectly balanced plant -- no overfeeding and no stochasticism (first row entry in this table); the actual GPSS output for this idealized case is presented as Appendix E. The average residence time in this case tallies exactly with the theoretical minimum computed in Table VII. The WIP figures for this idealized case, amounting to about two days of production, would represent the minimum attainable inventory in this hypothetical plant.

Key results from exploration of the various production scenarios are then summarized in Table IX. All of the results reported in this table are for the same amount of stochasticism (15%) in each of the plant operations. The base case for these scenarios has already appeared in Figure 19 and Table VIII (standard deviation/mean = 0.15).

Thus, the first set of scenarios presented in Table IX pertains to absent workers. In each of the scenarios explored, two variations were investigated, with three work stations impacted in all cases. In the first variation, none of these work stations were on the critical manufacturing route (from Table VII); thus, in this particular scenario variation, there was one less operating

Table IX

Key Results from Simulation of Various  
Production Scenarios (all with 15% Stochasticism)

Scenario <u>Description</u>	Average Production Rate, <u>pairs/day</u>	Average Residence Time, <u>min/pair</u>	Work-in-Process Inventory:	
			<u>pairs</u>	<u>parts</u>
Base Case	7,944	11.61	26,640	63,360
Absent Workers (or Machines Down)				
Not on critical route: 1 each from B3, C9 and C11	7,332	12.42	32,760	96,960
On critical route: 1 each from D6, F13 and C9	6,900	13.30	37,080	105,480
New Employee Trainees (60% efficient)				
Not on critical route: 1 each from B3, C9 and C11	7,752	11.87	28,560	74,880
On critical route: 1 each from D6, F13 and C9	7,416	12.43	31,920	84,600
New Equipment (25% more efficient)				
Not on critical route: 1 each from B3, C9 and C11	7,884	11.59	26,880	64,920

Table IX (continued)

On critical route: 1 each from D6, F13 and C9	8,016	11.01	25,200	52,800
---	-------	-------	--------	--------

work station for hemming back pockets (B3), topstitching back darts (C9) and attaching back pockets (C11). In the second variation (of each scenario), two of the three impacted work stations are on the critical manufacturing route. Specifically, these are making right flies (D6), attaching front pockets (F13) and topstitching back darts (C9), the first two of which are on the critical route and have an average processing time ( $t/N$ ) of 0.060 minute, corresponding to the nominal production rate of 8,000 pairs/day.

These absent workers scenarios were simulated by reducing each of the three appropriate GPSS storage (e.g., BHEM, TOPS and ABP) sizes by one unit, after completion of the standard 2-week startup period. The scenario simulation was then also run for a period of two weeks, which admittedly might be somewhat long for this scenario of absent workers. This 2-week production period was necessary in order to obtain realistic average daily production figures, in view of the stochasticism present in the model. Alternately, as Table IX indicates, one could view these scenarios as representing down machines at the affected work stations.

In any event, the results of Table IX show a dramatic decrease in production in this case of absent workers. As expected, the production drop is more serious for workers absent along the critical manufacturing route. Indeed, one would expect, in the latter case, the average production rate to decrease even further with time (longer than two weeks), specifically down to 6,400

pairs/day. This latter figure corresponds to an average processing time of 0.075 minute/pair, which results if the number of work stations dedicated to making right flies (on the critical route, unit processing time of 0.300 minute/pair) is permanently reduced from 5 to 4. The other indicators of manufacturing performance, average residence time and work-in-process inventory, are also impacted negatively in both of these scenario variations. That is, they both increase, more so for workers absent on the critical route, relative to the base case.

The second scenario presented in Table IX pertains to the training of new employees, again on and off of the critical manufacturing route. One each of three different work stations was again impacted in both cases. Representation of this scenario was achieved by assuming that any worker trainee performed at 60% of the production level of a trained employee. Thus, for example, in the case of making right flies (D6, five work stations total), both the mean value and standard deviation for this unit processing time were increased by:

$$\frac{(4)(1) + (1)(1/0.6)}{5} = 1.133$$

of their normal values (see Table VI). Specifically, the mean value and standard deviation (15% of mean) for this operation were increased from 3600 and 540 to 4080 and 612 GPSS time units,

respectively, per transaction (120 pairs). Similar arithmetic was performed for the other impacted operations in this scenario.

An alternate interpretation of this second scenario, related to the first scenario, is also possible. That is, this second one could be construed as representing absent workers but temporarily replaced with utility or cross-trained workers, functioning at lower efficiency levels. These second scenario variations were also run for a 2-week production period, after the standard 2-week startup period under normal operating conditions.

As expected, the results from Table IX show a deleterious effect on all of the manufacturing parameters -- average daily production rate (decrease), average residence time (increase) and work-in-process inventory (increase), when new or cross-trained employees are used to replace normal production workers. And again, these results are more dramatic when work stations along the critical manufacturing route are impacted.

The third and last scenario explored corresponded to the introduction of new and more efficient equipment at selected work stations (same ones as in the preceding scenarios). Specifically, it was assumed that each new type of equipment was 25% more efficient (productive) than the machines being replaced. Thus, again using the operation of right fly making as the example, the original values (Table VI) of the mean and standard deviation for this operation were both multiplied by  $1/1.25 = 0.8$ , to yield

shorter processing times. These simulations were also run for a 2-week production period, following a 2-week startup period. For this latter period, however, it was assumed that the new equipment was already in place, so that more realistic statistical output results would be obtained for the production period.

The results for this third scenario, from Table IX, are certainly not as dramatic as in the preceding scenarios. Thus, only about a 1% daily production rate increase is observed when new equipment is introduced at the two work stations along the critical manufacturing route, and a small production rate decrease is actually seen in the non-critical route variation. Both of these results are most probably within the noise level generated by the assumed stochasticism in the model. A similar comment applies to the other manufacturing performance indicators except for, perhaps, the WIP inventory of trouser parts, where a significant reduction is seen in the critical case. In any event, the essential point here is that not enough has been done (i.e., not enough money has been spent) to improve the production rate in this third scenario. In effect, all that the introduction of this limited amount of new equipment has served to do is to create some additional imbalance in the plant. Clearly, if increased production is the objective, then additional investment in new or more equipment, certainly on and perhaps off the critical manufacturing route, would be necessary.



## Conclusions

The first phase of this work clearly demonstrated the applicability of discrete-event simulation to a large commercial utility trouser manufacturing facility. The simulation results from the GPSS model are in good agreement with the limited production data, theoretical analyses and intuitional considerations. Despite the large size of the plant modelled here, however, this work by no means demonstrates the complete power and capabilities of discrete - event simulation, as applied to apparel manufacturing.

As discussed earlier, discrete-event simulation systems generally have the capability of representing stochastic or random events, resulting from human factors. Assuming that such data are available or can be estimated, standard probability distribution functions (e.g., uniform, normal, triangular, etc) can be employed for this purpose, as well as empirical, user-supplied distributions, as from a plant histogram. Thus, various levels of operator skill, training and availability at any given work station can be handled by representing the unit processing time in some such statistical fashion. Similarly, defects in product quality, requiring partial rework, can be simulated in statistical fashion. Numbers of work stations and processing times thereat can be easily varied to simulate different production scenarios (e.g., reduced workforce, increased demand, different maintenance practices, etc). Also, by proper selection of the operand value(s) for the initial GENERATE block, the expected production rate for a given

configuration could then be determined as simulation output.

Thus, the second phase of this work extended the applicability of a discrete-event simulation language, specifically GPSS/PC [10], to the modelling and analysis of a high-technology trouser manufacturing facility. This capability should be useful in either an engineering or production environment. That is, engineers could use this tool for the design of new facilities, expansion of existing facilities, line balancing, economic analysis, and a number of other useful applications. Similarly, production personnel could employ such a model on a day-to-day basis for planning and scheduling purposes. Strictly speaking, the model described in this work is not an on-line simulation tool. Each of the scenarios presented herein, however, required ten or less minutes of PC execution time, including that required for the startup or warmup period. This is certainly a rapid enough turnaround time for supplying answers to many production-related questions. Finally, it should be clear that discrete-event simulation can be readily applied to the manufacture of apparel items other than trousers.

## References

1. Banks, J. and Carson, J. S., Discrete-Event System Simulation, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1984.
2. Carrere, C. G. and Little, T. J., "A Case Study and Definition of Modular Manufacturing", International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology, 1989, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 30-38.
3. Livingston, D. L. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "Discrete-Event Simulation in the Design of Textile Finishing Processes", Textile Research Journal, 1989, Vol. 59, pp. 589-596.
4. Banks, J., Carson, J. S. and Sy, J. N., Getting Started with GPSS/H, Wolverine Software Corp., Annandale, VA, 1989.
5. Hiller, F. S. and Lieberman, G. J., Introduction to Operations Research, Holden-Day, San Francisco, 1967.
6. Schriber, T. J., Simulation Using GPSS, Wiley, New York, 1974.
7. Dunning, K. A., Getting Started in GPSS, Engineering Press, San Jose, CA, 1985.
8. Franta, W. R., The Process View of Simulation, Elsevier North-Holland, New York, 1977.

9. Wyman, F. P., Simulation Modeling: A Guide to Using SIMSCRIPT, Wiley, New York, 1970.
10. GPSS/PC Reference Manual, Minuteman Software, Stow, MA, 1988.
11. Wyman, F. P., "Simulation of Tar Sands Mining Operations", Interfaces, November 1977, Part 2, pp. 6-20.
12. Henriksen, J. O. and Schriber, T. J., "Simplified Approaches to Modelling Accumulating and Non-Accumulating Conveyor Systems", Proceedings of the 1986 Winter Simulation Conference, Washington, DC, December 1986, pp. 575-593.
13. Schriber, T. J., "A GPSS/H Model for a Hypothetical Flexible Manufacturing System", Annals of Operations Research, 1985, pp. 171-188.
14. Adebekun, A. K., Song, Z.-Q. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "GPSS Simulation of PVC Manufacture", Polymer Process Engineering, 1987, Vol. 5, pp. 145-150.
15. Ransbotham, S. B., Schwarzhoff, J. A. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "Discrete-Event Simulation of Penicillin Production", Process Biochemistry, 1988, Vol. 23, pp. 182-187.

16. Bales, W. J., Johnson, J. R. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "Use of a Queuing Simulator in Design of a Batch Chemical Production System", Production and Inventory Management Journal, 1988, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 36-41.
17. Barnette, D. T. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "Discrete-Event Simulation of a Sequence of Multi-Component Batch Distillation Columns", Computers and Chemical Engineering, 1987, Vol. 11, pp. 395-398.
18. Schultheisz, D. J. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "More Interest in Batch Simulation", Hydrocarbon Processing, 1989, Vol. 68 No. 6, pp. 73-75.
19. Schultheisz, D. J. and Sommerfeld, J. T., "Discrete-Event Simulation in Chemical Engineering", Chemical Engineering Education, 1988, Vol. 22., pp. 98-102.

## **Appendix A**

**Coding for GPSS Model of a Utility Trouser Manufacturing Plant**

```

; GPSS/PC Program File LPT1:. (V 2, # 38796) 05-24-1990 12:17:42
10 *****
20 * TROUSER MANUFACTURING PLANT
30 *****
40 ABP STORAGE 13
50 ALUP STORAGE 22
60 AWB STORAGE 11
70 BEND STORAGE 13
80 BHEM STORAGE 3
90 BHOL STORAGE 3
100 BLAB STORAGE 3
110 BUTB STORAGE 4
120 BFLY STORAGE 3
130 CLIP STORAGE 2
140 CODER STORAGE 14
150 CRSE STORAGE 4
160 CRPC STORAGE 4
170 CUTTR STORAGE 11
180 DARTS STORAGE 4
190 FHEM STORAGE 3
200 FOLD STORAGE 11
210 FPOC STORAGE 13
220 INS STORAGE 12
230 INSP STORAGE 19
240 JOINT STORAGE 6
250 LFLY STORAGE 4
260 LUPS STORAGE 2
270 MFLY STORAGE 1
280 PRES STORAGE 5
290 RFLY STORAGE 5
300 SBTN STORAGE 3
310 SEAM STORAGE 11
320 SEAT STORAGE 5
330 SETL STORAGE 7
340 SETR STORAGE 7
350 SLAB STORAGE 5
360 SLDE STORAGE 7
370 SPRED STORAGE 4
380 STCH STORAGE 2
390 TOPF STORAGE 5
400 TOPS STORAGE 4
410 JIT TABLE M1,800,40,9
420 *****Model segment 1 *****
430 GENERATE 960,,2
440 ENTER SPRED
450 ADVANCE 3000
460 LEAVE SPRED
470 QUEUE QCUTR
480 ENTER CUTTR
490 DEPART QCUTR
500 ADVANCE 10000
510 LEAVE CUTTR
520 QUEUE QCODE

```

530	ENTER	CODER	
540	DEPART	QCODE	
550	ADVANCE	13000	
560	LEAVE	CODER	
570	SPLIT	1,BPOCS	
580	SPLIT	1,BPANS	
590	SPLIT	1,FLIES	
600	SPLIT	1,FPOCS	
610	SPLIT	1,FPANS	
620	SPLIT	1,BANDS	
630	TRANSFER	,BLUPS	
640	*****Model segment 2 *****		
650	BPOCS	ADVANCE	;Back pocket matl dist
660	QUEUE	QBHEM	;waiting for machine
670	ENTER	BHEM	
680	DEPART	QBHEM	;depart machine waiting line
690	ADVANCE	2672	
700	LEAVE	BHEM	;machine finished
710	QUEUE	QCLIP	
720	ENTER	CLIP	;clip/stitch back pocket
730	DEPART	QCLIP	
740	ADVANCE	1392	
750	LEAVE	CLIP	
760	QUEUE	QBHOL	;line for button hole machin
770	ENTER	BHOL	
780	DEPART	QBHOL	
790	ADVANCE	2464	
800	LEAVE	BHOL	
810	QUEUE	QCRSE	;crease back pocket
820	ENTER	CRSE	
830	DEPART	QCRSE	
840	ADVANCE	3840	
850	LEAVE	CRSE	
860	QUEUE	QBPOC	
870	TRANSFER	,FBACK	
880	*****Model segment 3 *****		
890	BPANS	ADVANCE	;Back panel matl dist & code
900	QUEUE	QBLAB	
910	ENTER	BLAB	;sew back label
920	DEPART	QBLAB	
930	ADVANCE	2672	
940	LEAVE	BLAB	
950	QUEUE	QDART	
960	ENTER	DARTS	;sew darts on back panel
970	DEPART	QDART	
980	ADVANCE	3232	
990	LEAVE	DARTS	
1000	QUEUE	QTOPS	
1010	ENTER	TOPS	;topstitch parts
1020	DEPART	QTOPS	
1030	ADVANCE	3152	
1040	LEAVE	TOPS	
1050	QUEUE	QSBTN	
1060	ENTER	SBTN	;sew buttons on back panel



1070	DEPART	QSBTN	
1080	ADVANCE	2352	
1090	LEAVE	SBTN	
1100	QUEUE	QBPAN	
1110	FBACK ASSEMBLE	2	;combine back panel & pocke
1120	DEPART	QBPOC	
1130	DEPART	QBPAN	
1140	QUEUE	QABP	
1150	ENTER	ABP	
1160	DEPART	QABP	
1170	ADVANCE	12048	;attach/set back pocket
1180	LEAVE	ABP	
1190	QUEUE	QBCK	
1200	TRANSFER	,FBKS	
1210	*****Model segment 4 *****		
1220	FLIES ADVANCE		;fly material dist & coded
1230	QUEUE	QMFLY	
1240	ENTER	MFLY	;make fly
1250	DEPART	QMFLY	
1260	ADVANCE	688	
1270	LEAVE	MFLY	
1280	QUEUE	QLFLY	
1290	ENTER	LFLY	
1300	DEPART	QLFLY	
1310	ADVANCE	3152	
1320	LEAVE	LFLY	
1330	QUEUE	QTOPF	
1340	ENTER	TOPF	;topstitch fly
1350	DEPART	QTOPF	
1360	ADVANCE	4384	
1370	LEAVE	TOPF	
1380	QUEUE	QRFLY	
1390	ENTER	RFLY	;set zipper in right fly
1400	DEPART	QRFLY	
1410	ADVANCE	4320	
1420	LEAVE	RFLY	
1430	QUEUE	QFLYS	
1440	TRANSFER	,FRNT	
1450	*****Model segment 5 *****		
1460	FPOCS ADVANCE		
1470	QUEUE	QFHEM	
1480	ENTER	FHEM	;hem front pockets
1490	DEPART	QFHEM	
1500	ADVANCE	2672	
1510	LEAVE	FHEM	
1520	QUEUE	QSTCH	
1530	ENTER	STCH	;crease front pockets
1540	DEPART	QSTCH	
1550	ADVANCE	1392	
1560	LEAVE	STCH	
1570	QUEUE	QCRPC	
1580	ENTER	CRPC	;crease front pocket
1590	DEPART	QCRPC	
1600	ADVANCE	3840	

1610	LEAVE	CRPC	
1620	QUEUE	QFFP	
1630	TRANSFER	,FPANL	;match front pockets
1640	*****Model segment 6 *****		
1650	FPANS	ADVANCE	
1660	QUEUE	QFPAN	
1670	FPANL	ASSEMBLE	2
1680	DEPART	QFFP	
1690	DEPART	QFPAN	
1700	QUEUE	QFPOC	
1710	ENTER	FPOC	;stitch frt pocket on panel
1720	DEPART	QFPOC	
1730	ADVANCE	12048	
1740	LEAVE	FPOC	
1750	QUEUE	QFPNL	
1760	FRNT	ASSEMBLE	2 ;assemble lt&rt flies
1770	DEPART	QFPNL	
1780	DEPART	QFLYS	
1790	QUEUE	QSETL	
1800	ENTER	SETL	;set left fly
1810	DEPART	QSETL	
1820	ADVANCE	6464	
1830	LEAVE	SETL	
1840	QUEUE	QSETR	
1850	ENTER	SETR	;set right fly
1860	DEPART	QSETR	
1870	ADVANCE	6016	
1880	LEAVE	SETR	
1890	QUEUE	QFRT	
1900	FBKS	ASSEMBLE	2
1910	DEPART	QFRT	
1920	DEPART	QBCK	
1930	QUEUE	QSEAM	
1940	ENTER	SEAM	
1950	DEPART	QSEAM	
1960	ADVANCE	10160	
1970	LEAVE	SEAM	
1980	QUEUE	QSEAT	
1990	ENTER	SEAT	;sew seat seam
2000	DEPART	QSEAT	
2010	ADVANCE	4592	
2020	LEAVE	SEAT	
2030	QUEUE	QBPNL	
2040	TRANSFER	,BNDS	;assembly at waist band
2050	*****Model segment 7 *****		
2060	BANDS	ADVANCE	
2070	QUEUE	QBND	
2080	BNDS	ASSEMBLE	2
2090	DEPART	QBPNL	
2100	DEPART	QBND	
2110	QUEUE	QAWB	
2120	ENTER	AWB	;attach waist band
2130	DEPART	QAWB	
2140	ADVANCE	10448	

2150	LEAVE	AWB	
2160	QUEUE	QBFLY	
2170	ENTER	BFLY	;attach button flys
2180	DEPART	QBFLY	
2190	ADVANCE	2832	
2200	LEAVE	BFLY	
2210	QUEUE	QBEND	
2220	ENTER	BEND	;close band ends
2230	DEPART	QBEND	
2240	ADVANCE	12480	
2250	LEAVE	BEND	
2260	QUEUE	QSLDE	
2270	ENTER	SLDE	;slide stops on zipper
2280	DEPART	QSLDE	
2290	ADVANCE	6272	
2300	LEAVE	SLDE	
2310	TRANSFER	,COMBIN	
2320	*****Model Segment 8*****		
2330	COMBIN QUEUE	QJOIN	
2340	ENTER	JOINT	;join fronts
2350	DEPART	QJOIN	
2360	ADVANCE	5584	
2370	LEAVE	JOINT	
2380	QUEUE	QINS	
2390	ENTER	INS	;sew inseam
2400	DEPART	QINS	
2410	ADVANCE	10784	
2420	LEAVE	INS	
2430	QUEUE	QBUTB	
2440	ENTER	BUTB	;buttonhole the band
2450	DEPART	QBUTB	
2460	ADVANCE	3216	
2470	LEAVE	BUTB	
2480	QUEUE	QEVRY	
2490	TRANSFER	,FEVRY	;transfer to attach belt
2500	*****Model segment 9*****		
2510	BLUPS ADVANCE		
2520	QUEUE	QLUPS	
2530	ENTER	LUPS	;make belt loops
2540	DEPART	QLUPS	
2550	ADVANCE	1232	
2560	LEAVE	LUPS	
2570	QUEUE	QBL	
2580	FEVRY ASSEMBLE	2	
2590	DEPART	QEVRY	
2600	DEPART	QBL	
2610	QUEUE	QALUP	
2620	ENTER	ALUP	;attach belt loops
2630	DEPART	QALUP	
2640	ADVANCE	20688	
2650	LEAVE	ALUP	
2660	QUEUE	QSLAB	
2670	ENTER	SLAB	;sew labels on
2680	DEPART	QSLAB	

2690	ADVANCE	4720	
2700	LEAVE	SLAB	
2710	QUEUE	QFOLD	
2720	ENTER	FOLD	;press/fold
2730	DEPART	QFOLD	
2740	ADVANCE	9904	
2750	LEAVE	FOLD	
2760	QUEUE	QPRES	
2770	ENTER	PRES	;top press
2780	DEPART	QPRES	
2790	ADVANCE	4384	
2800	LEAVE	PRES	
2810	QUEUE	QINSP	
2820	ENTER	INSP	;inspect/fold
2830	DEPART	QINSP	
2840	ADVANCE	17552	
2850	LEAVE	INSP	
2860	TABULATE	JIT	
2870	TERMINATE		
2880	*****Model Segment 9 *****		
2890	TIMER GENERATE	48000	
2900	TERMINATE	1	
2910	*****Model Segment 10 *****		
2920	START	10	
2930	RESET		
2940	START	20	

## **Appendix B**

**Sample Output from GPSS Model of a Utility Trouser Manufacturing Plant  
(Balanced Operation)**

START_TIME	END_TIME	BLOCKS	FACILITIES	STORAGES	FREE_MEMORY
480002	1440000	239	0	37	148896

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
430	1	GENERATE	1000	0	0
440	2	ENTER	1000	0	0
450	3	ADVANCE	1003	3	0
460	4	LEAVE	1000	0	0
470	5	QUEUE	1000	0	0
480	6	ENTER	1000	0	0
490	7	DEPART	1000	0	0
500	8	ADVANCE	1010	10	0
510	9	LEAVE	1000	0	0
520	10	QUEUE	1000	0	0
530	11	ENTER	1000	0	0
540	12	DEPART	1000	0	0
550	13	ADVANCE	1014	14	0
560	14	LEAVE	1000	0	0
570	15	SPLIT	1000	0	0
580	16	SPLIT	1000	0	0
590	17	SPLIT	1000	0	0
600	18	SPLIT	1000	0	0
610	19	SPLIT	1000	0	0
620	20	SPLIT	1000	0	0
630	21	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
650	BPOCS	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
660	23	QUEUE	1000	0	0
670	24	ENTER	1000	0	0
680	25	DEPART	1000	0	0
690	26	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
700	27	LEAVE	1000	0	0
710	28	QUEUE	1000	0	0
720	29	ENTER	1000	0	0
730	30	DEPART	1000	0	0
740	31	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
750	32	LEAVE	1000	0	0
760	33	QUEUE	1000	0	0
770	34	ENTER	1000	0	0
780	35	DEPART	1000	0	0
790	36	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
800	37	LEAVE	1000	0	0
810	38	QUEUE	1000	0	0
820	39	ENTER	1000	0	0
830	40	DEPART	1000	0	0
840	41	ADVANCE	1004	4	0
850	42	LEAVE	1000	0	0
860	43	QUEUE	1000	0	0
870	44	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
890	BPANS	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
900	46	QUEUE	1000	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
910	47	ENTER	1000	0	0
920	48	DEPART	1000	0	0
930	49	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
940	50	LEAVE	1000	0	0
950	51	QUEUE	1000	0	0
960	52	ENTER	1000	0	0
970	53	DEPART	1000	0	0
980	54	ADVANCE	1004	4	0
990	55	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1000	56	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1010	57	ENTER	1000	0	0
1020	58	DEPART	1000	0	0
1030	59	ADVANCE	1003	3	0
1040	60	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1050	61	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1060	62	ENTER	1000	0	0
1070	63	DEPART	1000	0	0
1080	64	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
1090	65	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1100	66	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1110	FBACK	ASSEMBLE	2001	1	0
1120	68	DEPART	1000	0	0
1130	69	DEPART	1000	0	0
1140	70	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1150	71	ENTER	1000	0	0
1160	72	DEPART	1000	0	0
1170	73	ADVANCE	1013	13	0
1180	74	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1190	75	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1200	76	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
1220	FLIES	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
1230	78	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1240	79	ENTER	1000	0	0
1250	80	DEPART	1000	0	0
1260	81	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
1270	82	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1280	83	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1290	84	ENTER	1000	0	0
1300	85	DEPART	1000	0	0
1310	86	ADVANCE	1004	4	0
1320	87	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1330	88	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1340	89	ENTER	1000	0	0
1350	90	DEPART	1000	0	0
1360	91	ADVANCE	1004	4	0
1370	92	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1380	93	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1390	94	ENTER	1000	0	0
1400	95	DEPART	1000	0	0
1410	96	ADVANCE	1005	5	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK TYPE	ENTRY COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
1420	97	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1430	98	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1440	99	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
1460	FPOCS	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
1470	101	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1480	102	ENTER	1000	0	0
1490	103	DEPART	1000	0	0
1500	104	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
1510	105	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1520	106	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1530	107	ENTER	1000	0	0
1540	108	DEPART	1000	0	0
1550	109	ADVANCE	1002	2	0
1560	110	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1570	111	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1580	112	ENTER	1000	0	0
1590	113	DEPART	1000	0	0
1600	114	ADVANCE	1004	4	0
1610	115	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1620	116	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1630	117	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
1650	FPANS	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
1660	119	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1670	FPANL	ASSEMBLE	2008	8	0
1680	121	DEPART	1000	0	0
1690	122	DEPART	1000	0	0
1700	123	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1710	124	ENTER	1000	0	0
1720	125	DEPART	1000	0	0
1730	126	ADVANCE	1012	12	0
1740	127	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1750	128	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1760	FRNT	ASSEMBLE	2007	7	0
1770	130	DEPART	1000	0	0
1780	131	DEPART	1000	0	0
1790	132	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1800	133	ENTER	1000	0	0
1810	134	DEPART	1000	0	0
1820	135	ADVANCE	1007	7	0
1830	136	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1840	137	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1850	138	ENTER	1000	0	0
1860	139	DEPART	1000	0	0
1870	140	ADVANCE	1006	6	0
1880	141	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1890	142	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1900	FBKS	ASSEMBLE	2009	9	0
1910	144	DEPART	1000	0	0
1920	145	DEPART	1000	0	0
1930	146	QUEUE	1000	0	0



LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
1940	147	ENTER	1000	0	0
1950	148	DEPART	1000	0	0
1960	149	ADVANCE	1011	11	0
1970	150	LEAVE	1000	0	0
1980	151	QUEUE	1000	0	0
1990	152	ENTER	1000	0	0
2000	153	DEPART	1000	0	0
2010	154	ADVANCE	1005	5	0
2020	155	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2030	156	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2040	157	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
2060	BANDS	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
2070	159	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2080	BNDS	ASSEMBLE	2049	49	0
2090	161	DEPART	1000	0	0
2100	162	DEPART	1000	0	0
2110	163	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2120	164	ENTER	1000	0	0
2130	165	DEPART	1000	0	0
2140	166	ADVANCE	1011	11	0
2150	167	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2160	168	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2170	169	ENTER	1000	0	0
2180	170	DEPART	1000	0	0
2190	171	ADVANCE	1003	3	0
2200	172	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2210	173	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2220	174	ENTER	1000	0	0
2230	175	DEPART	1000	0	0
2240	176	ADVANCE	1013	13	0
2250	177	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2260	178	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2270	179	ENTER	1000	0	0
2280	180	DEPART	1000	0	0
2290	181	ADVANCE	1006	6	0
2300	182	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2310	183	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
2330	COMBIN	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2340	185	ENTER	1000	0	0
2350	186	DEPART	1000	0	0
2360	187	ADVANCE	1006	6	0
2370	188	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2380	189	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2390	190	ENTER	1000	0	0
2400	191	DEPART	1000	0	0
2410	192	ADVANCE	1011	11	0
2420	193	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2430	194	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2440	195	ENTER	1000	0	0
2450	196	DEPART	1000	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
2460	197	ADVANCE	1004	4	0
2470	198	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2480	199	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2490	200	TRANSFER	1000	0	0
2510	BLUPS	ADVANCE	1000	0	0
2520	202	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2530	203	ENTER	1000	0	0
2540	204	DEPART	1000	0	0
2550	205	ADVANCE	1001	1	0
2560	206	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2570	207	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2580	FEVRY	ASSEMBLE	2102	102	0
2590	209	DEPART	1000	0	0
2600	210	DEPART	1000	0	0
2610	211	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2620	212	ENTER	1000	0	0
2630	213	DEPART	1000	0	0
2640	214	ADVANCE	1021	21	0
2650	215	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2660	216	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2670	217	ENTER	1000	0	0
2680	218	DEPART	1000	0	0
2690	219	ADVANCE	1005	5	0
2700	220	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2710	221	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2720	222	ENTER	1000	0	0
2730	223	DEPART	1000	0	0
2740	224	ADVANCE	1010	10	0
2750	225	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2760	226	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2770	227	ENTER	1000	0	0
2780	228	DEPART	1000	0	0
2790	229	ADVANCE	1005	5	0
2800	230	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2810	231	QUEUE	1000	0	0
2820	232	ENTER	1000	0	0
2830	233	DEPART	1000	0	0
2840	234	ADVANCE	1018	18	0
2850	235	LEAVE	1000	0	0
2860	236	TABULATE	1000	0	0
2870	237	TERMINATE	1000	0	0
2890	TIMER	GENERATE	20	0	0
2900	239	TERMINATE	20	0	0

QUEUE	MAX	CONT.	ENTRIES	ENTRIES(0)	AVE.CONT.	AVE.TIME	AVE.(-0)	RETRY
QCUTR	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QCODE	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBHEM	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QCLIP	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0

QUEUE	MAX	CONT.	ENTRIES	ENTRIES(0)	AVE.CONT.	AVE.TIME	AVE.(-0)	RETRY
QBHOL	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QCRSE	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBPOC	2	1	1001	0	1.08	1038.96	1038.96	0
QBLAB	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QDART	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QTOPS	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSBTN	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBPAN	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QABP	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBACK	10	9	1009	0	9.35	8895.92	8895.92	0
QMFLY	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QLFLY	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QTOPF	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QRFLY	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFLYS	8	7	1007	0	7.72	7356.49	7356.49	0
QFHEM	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSTCH	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QCRPC	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFFP	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFPAN	9	8	1008	0	8.23	7841.25	7841.25	0
QFPOC	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFPNL	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSETL	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSETR	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFRT	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSEAM	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSEAT	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBPNL	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBND5	50	49	1049	0	49.15	44979.89	44979.89	0
QAWB	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBFLY	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBEND	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSLDE	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QJOIN	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QINS	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBUTB	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QEVRY	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QLUPS	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBL	102	102	1102	0	101.63	88537.02	88537.02	0
QALUP	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSLAB	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFOLD	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QPRES	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QINSP	1	0	1000	1000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0

STORAGE	CAP.	REMAIN.	MIN.	MAX.	ENTRIES	AVL.	AVE.C.	UTIL.	RETRY	DELAY
ABP	13	0	12	13	1013	1	12.55	0.965	0	0
ALUP	22	1	21	22	1021	1	21.55	0.980	0	0
AWB	11	0	10	11	1011	1	10.88	0.989	0	0

STORAGE	CAP.	REMAIN.	MIN.	MAX.	ENTRIES	AVL.	AVE.C.	UTIL.	RETRY	DELAY
BEND	13	0	12	13	1013	1	13.00	1.000	0	0
BHEM	3	1	2	3	1002	1	2.78	0.928	0	0
BHOL	3	1	2	3	1002	1	2.57	0.856	0	0
BLAB	3	1	2	3	1002	1	2.78	0.928	0	0
BUTB	4	0	3	4	1004	1	3.35	0.837	0	0
BFLY	3	0	2	3	1003	1	2.95	0.983	0	0
CLIP	2	0	1	2	1002	1	1.45	0.725	0	0
CODER	14	0	13	14	1014	1	13.54	0.967	0	0
CRSE	4	0	3	4	1004	1	4.00	1.000	0	0
CRPC	4	0	3	4	1004	1	4.00	1.000	0	0
CUTTR	11	1	10	11	1010	1	10.42	0.947	0	0
DARTS	4	0	3	4	1004	1	3.37	0.842	0	0
FHEM	3	1	2	3	1002	1	2.78	0.928	0	0
FOLD	11	1	10	11	1010	1	10.32	0.938	0	0
FPOC	13	1	12	13	1012	1	12.55	0.965	0	0
INS	12	1	11	12	1011	1	11.23	0.936	0	0
INSP	19	1	18	19	1018	1	18.28	0.962	0	0
JOINT	6	0	5	6	1006	1	5.82	0.969	0	0
LFLY	4	0	3	4	1004	1	3.28	0.821	0	0
LUPS	2	1	1	2	1001	1	1.28	0.642	0	0
MFLY	1	1	0	1	1000	1	0.72	0.717	0	0
PRES	5	0	4	5	1005	1	4.57	0.913	0	0
RFLY	5	0	4	5	1005	1	4.50	0.900	0	0
SBTN	3	1	2	3	1002	1	2.45	0.817	0	0
SEAM	11	0	10	11	1011	1	10.58	0.962	0	0
SEAT	5	0	4	5	1005	1	4.78	0.957	0	0
SETL	7	0	6	7	1007	1	6.73	0.962	0	0
SETR	7	1	6	7	1006	1	6.27	0.895	0	0
SLAB	5	0	4	5	1005	1	4.92	0.983	0	0
SLDE	7	1	6	7	1006	1	6.53	0.933	0	0
SPRED	4	1	3	4	1003	1	3.13	0.781	0	0
STCH	2	0	1	2	1002	1	1.45	0.725	0	0
TOPF	5	1	4	5	1004	1	4.57	0.913	0	0
TOPS	4	1	3	4	1003	1	3.28	0.821	0	0

TABLE	MEAN	STD.DEV.	RETRY	RANGE	FREQUENCY	CUM. %
JIT	182048.00	0.00	0	1080 -	1000	100.00

XACT_GROUP	GROUP_SIZE	RETRY
POSITION	0	0

## **Appendix C**

**Coding for GPSS Model of a Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing Plant**

```

; GPSS/PC Program File LPT1:. (V 2, # 38796) 05-24-1990 11:47:31
10 *****
20 * HI-TECH MODEL *****
30 *****
40 ABL STORAGE 10
50 ABP STORAGE 8
60 AFLY STORAGE 7
70 AFP STORAGE 8
80 AWB STORAGE 8
90 BEND STORAGE 8
100 BHEM STORAGE 4
110 BHOL STORAGE 2
120 BLAB STORAGE 3
130 BUTN STORAGE 3
140 CODER STORAGE 5
150 CUTTR STORAGE 4
160 DARTS STORAGE 4
170 FHEM STORAGE 4
180 FINF STORAGE 6
190 FOLD STORAGE 11
200 INS STORAGE 12
210 JOINT STORAGE 5
220 LFLY STORAGE 1
230 LUPS STORAGE 2
240 MBKS STORAGE 1
250 MFTS STORAGE 1
260 MFBS STORAGE 1
270 PRES STORAGE 5
280 RFLY STORAGE 5
290 SEAM STORAGE 5
300 SIDE STORAGE 11
310 SPRED STORAGE 3
320 SPEC STORAGE 19
330 TACK STORAGE 5
340 TFLY STORAGE 5
350 TOPS STORAGE 4
360 UPS STORAGE 2
370 *****
380 SNORM FUNCTION RN1,C25
0,-5/ .00003,-4/ .00135,-3/ .00621,-2.5/ .02275,-2/ .06681,-1.5/ .11507,-1.2
.15866,-1/ .21186,-.8/ .27425,-.6/ .34458,-.4/ .42074,-.2/ .5,0 / .57926,.2
.65542,.4/ .72575,.6/ .78814,.8/ .84134,1/ .88493,1.2/ .93319,1.5/ .97725,2
.99379,2.5/ .99865,3/ .99997,4/ 1,5
390 MEAN FUNCTION P4,D33
1,924/ 2,2448/ 3,2472/ 4,1200/ 5,660/ 6,3600/ 7,3600/ 8,2496/ 9,2364/ 10,2004
11,5760/ 12,3384/ 13,5760/ 14,4848/ 15,3288/ 16,4188/ 17,480/ 18,1200/ 19,7620
20,8088/ 21,5244/ 22,5208/ 23,1572/ 24,7152/ 25,3540/ 26,7428/ 27,3288
28,13164/ 29,1542/ 30,2057/ 31,2572/ 32,480/ 33,480
400 SDEV FUNCTION P4,D33
1,139/ 2,367/ 3,371/ 4,180/ 5,99/ 6,540/ 7,540/ 8,374/ 9,355/ 10,301/ 11,364
12,508/ 13,864/ 14,727/ 15,493/ 16,628/ 17,72/ 18,180/ 19,1143/ 20,1213/
21,787/ 22,781/ 23,236/ 24,1073/ 25,531/ 26,1114/ 27,493/ 28,1975/ 29,231
30,309/ 31,386/ 32,72/ 33,72
410 SERVE FVARIABLE FN$SDEV#FN$SNORM+FN$MEAN

```

```

415 JIT      TABLE      M1,600,30,9
420 *****Model segment 1 *****
430          GENERATE      685,,2
440          ENTER        SPRED
450          ASSIGN        4,29
460          ADVANCE       V$SERVE
470          LEAVE         SPRED
480          QUEUE         QCUTR
490          ENTER         CUTTR
500          DEPART        QCUTR
510          ASSIGN        4,30
520          ADVANCE       V$SERVE
530          LEAVE         CUTTR
540          QUEUE         QCODE
550          ENTER         CODER
560          DEPART        QCODE
570          ASSIGN        4,31
580          ADVANCE       V$SERVE
590          LEAVE         CODER
600          SPLIT         1,BPOCS
610          SPLIT         1,BPANS
620          SPLIT         1,FLIES
630          SPLIT         1,FPOCS
640          SPLIT         1,FPANS
650          SPLIT         1,BLUPS
660          QUEUE         QBND
670          TRANSFER      ,FEVRY
680 *****Model segment 2 *****
690 BPOCS     ADVANCE                               ;Back pocket matl dist
700          QUEUE         QBHEM                     ;waiting for machine
710          ENTER         BHEM
720          DEPART        QBHEM                     ;depart machine waiting line
730          ASSIGN        4,3
740          ADVANCE       V$SERVE
750          LEAVE         BHEM                       ;machine finished
760          QUEUE         QBHOL                     ;line for button hole machin
770          ENTER         BHOL
780          DEPART        QBHOL
790          ASSIGN        4,4
800          ADVANCE       V$SERVE
810          LEAVE         BHOL
820          QUEUE         QBPOC
830          TRANSFER      ,FBACK
840 *****Model segment 3 *****
850 BPANS     ADVANCE                               ;Back panel matl dist & codec
860          QUEUE         QBPAN
870 FBACK     ASSEMBLE      2
880          DEPART        QBPOC
890          DEPART        QBPAN
900          QUEUE         QMBKS
910          ENTER         MBKS
920          DEPART        QMBKS
930          ASSIGN        4,32
940          ADVANCE       V$SERVE

```

950	LEAVE	MBKS	
960	QUEUE	QDART	
970	ENTER	DARTS	
980	DEPART	QDART	
990	ASSIGN	4,8	
1000	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1010	LEAVE	DARTS	
1020	QUEUE	QTOPS	
1030	ENTER	TOPS	
1040	DEPART	QTOPS	
1050	ASSIGN	4,9	
1060	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1070	LEAVE	TOPS	
1080	QUEUE	QBLAB	
1090	ENTER	BLAB	
1100	DEPART	QBLAB	
1110	ASSIGN	4,10	
1120	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1130	LEAVE	BLAB	
1140	QUEUE	QABP	
1150	ENTER	ABP	
1160	DEPART	QABP	
1170	ASSIGN	4,11	
1180	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1190	LEAVE	ABP	
1200	QUEUE	QSEAM	
1210	ENTER	SEAM	
1220	DEPART	QSEAM	
1230	ASSIGN	4,12	
1240	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1250	LEAVE	SEAM	
1260	QUEUE	QMB	
1270	TRANSFER	,FEVRY	;sent to segment 7
1280	*****Model segment 4 *****		
1290	FLIES ADVANCE		;fly material dist & coded
1300	QUEUE	QLFLY	
1310	ENTER	LFLY	
1320	DEPART	QLFLY	
1330	ASSIGN	4,5	
1340	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1350	LEAVE	LFLY	
1360	QUEUE	QRFLY	
1370	ENTER	RFLY	
1380	DEPART	QRFLY	
1390	ASSIGN	4,6	
1400	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1410	LEAVE	RFLY	
1420	QUEUE	QJOIN	
1430	ENTER	JOINT	
1440	DEPART	QJOIN	
1450	ASSIGN	4,7	
1460	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
1470	LEAVE	JOINT	
1480	QUEUE	QFLYS	
1490	TRANSFER	,FPANL	;sent to segment 6



```

1500 *****Model segment 5 *****
1510 FPOCS ADVANCE ;front pocket matl dist
1520 QUEUE QFHEM
1530 ENTER FHEM
1540 DEPART QFHEM
1550 ASSIGN 4,2
1560 ADVANCE V$SERVE
1570 LEAVE FHEM
1580 QUEUE QFPOC
1590 TRANSFER ,FPANL ;sent to segment 6
1600 *****Model segment 6 *****
1610 FPANS ADVANCE
1620 QUEUE QFPAN
1630 FPANL ASSEMBLE 3 ;gather and destroy segments
1640 DEPART QFLYS ;destroy segment 4
1650 DEPART QFPOC ;destroy segment 5
1660 DEPART QFPAN
1670 QUEUE QMFTS
1680 ENTER MFTS
1690 DEPART QMFTS
1700 ASSIGN 4,33
1710 ADVANCE V$SERVE
1720 LEAVE MFTS
1730 QUEUE QAFP
1740 ENTER AFP
1750 DEPART QAFP
1760 ASSIGN 4,13
1770 ADVANCE V$SERVE
1780 LEAVE AFP
1790 QUEUE QAFLY
1800 ENTER AFLY
1810 DEPART QAFLY
1820 ASSIGN 4,14
1830 ADVANCE V$SERVE
1840 LEAVE AFLY
1850 QUEUE QTFLY
1860 ENTER TFLY
1870 DEPART QTFLY
1880 ASSIGN 4,15
1890 ADVANCE V$SERVE
1900 LEAVE TFLY
1910 QUEUE QFINF
1920 ENTER FINF
1930 DEPART QFINF
1940 ASSIGN 4,16
1950 ADVANCE V$SERVE
1960 LEAVE FINF
1970 QUEUE QMF
1980 TRANSFER ,FEVRY ;sent to segment 7
1990 *****Model segment 7*****
2000 BLUPS ADVANCE
2010 QUEUE QLUPS
2020 ENTER LUPS
2030 DEPART QLUPS
2040 ASSIGN 4,1

```

2050	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2060	LEAVE	LUPS	
2070	QUEUE	QBL	
2080	FEVRY ASSEMBLE	4	
2090	DEPART	QMB	;segment 3 destroyed
2100	DEPART	QMF	
2110	DEPART	QBNDS	
2120	DEPART	QBL	
2130	QUEUE	QMFBS	
2140	ENTER	MFBS	
2150	DEPART	QMFBS	
2160	ASSIGN	4,17	
2170	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2180	LEAVE	MFBS	
2190	QUEUE	QUPS	
2200	ENTER	UPS	
2210	DEPART	QUPS	
2220	ASSIGN	4,18	
2230	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2240	LEAVE	UPS	
2250	QUEUE	QSIDE	
2260	ENTER	SIDE	
2270	DEPART	QSIDE	
2280	ASSIGN	4,19	
2290	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2300	LEAVE	SIDE	
2310	*****Model segment 8 *****		
2320	QUEUE	QINS	
2330	ENTER	INS	
2340	DEPART	QINS	
2350	ASSIGN	4,20	
2360	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2370	LEAVE	INS	
2380	QUEUE	QAWB	
2390	ENTER	AWB	
2400	DEPART	QAWB	
2410	ASSIGN	4,21	
2420	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2430	LEAVE	AWB	
2440	QUEUE	QBEND	
2450	ENTER	BEND	
2460	DEPART	QBEND	
2470	ASSIGN	4,22	
2480	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2490	LEAVE	BEND	
2500	QUEUE	QBUTN	
2510	ENTER	BUTN	
2520	DEPART	QBUTN	
2530	ASSIGN	4,23	
2540	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE	
2550	LEAVE	BUTN	
2560	QUEUE	QABL	
2570	ENTER	ABL	
2580	DEPART	QABL	

2590	ASSIGN	4,24
2600	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE
2610	LEAVE	ABL
2620	QUEUE	QTACK
2630	ENTER	TACK
2640	DEPART	QTACK
2650	ASSIGN	4,25
2660	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE
2670	LEAVE	TACK
2680	QUEUE	QFOLD
2690	ENTER	FOLD
2700	DEPART	QFOLD
2710	ASSIGN	4,26
2720	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE
2730	LEAVE	FOLD
2740	QUEUE	QPRES
2750	ENTER	PRES
2760	DEPART	QPRES
2770	ASSIGN	4,27
2780	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE
2790	LEAVE	PRES
2800	QUEUE	QSPEC
2810	ENTER	SPEC
2820	DEPART	QSPEC
2830	ASSIGN	4,28
2840	ADVANCE	V\$SERVE
2850	LEAVE	SPEC
2855	TABULATE	JIT
2860	TERMINATE	
2870	*****Model segment 9*****	
2880	TIMER GENERATE	48000
2890	TERMINATE	1
2900	*****Control Statements*****	
2910	START	10
2920	RESET	
2930	START	20

## **Appendix D**

**Sample Output from GPSS Model of a Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing  
Plant (Base Case of 15% Stochasticism)**

START_TIME	END_TIME	BLOCKS	FACILITIES	STORAGES	FREE_MEMORY
480032	960000	240	0	33	89424

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
430	1	GENERATE	701	0	0
440	2	ENTER	701	0	0
450	3	ASSIGN	701	0	0
460	4	ADVANCE	703	2	0
470	5	LEAVE	701	0	0
480	6	QUEUE	701	0	0
490	7	ENTER	701	0	0
500	8	DEPART	701	0	0
510	9	ASSIGN	701	0	0
520	10	ADVANCE	703	3	0
530	11	LEAVE	700	0	0
540	12	QUEUE	700	0	0
550	13	ENTER	700	0	0
560	14	DEPART	700	0	0
570	15	ASSIGN	700	0	0
580	16	ADVANCE	705	4	0
590	17	LEAVE	701	0	0
600	18	SPLIT	701	0	0
610	19	SPLIT	701	0	0
620	20	SPLIT	701	0	0
630	21	SPLIT	701	0	0
640	22	SPLIT	701	0	0
650	23	SPLIT	701	0	0
660	24	QUEUE	701	0	0
670	25	TRANSFER	701	0	0
690	BPOCS	ADVANCE	701	0	0
700	27	QUEUE	701	0	0
710	28	ENTER	701	0	0
720	29	DEPART	701	0	0
730	30	ASSIGN	701	0	0
740	31	ADVANCE	705	4	0
750	32	LEAVE	701	0	0
760	33	QUEUE	701	0	0
770	34	ENTER	701	0	0
780	35	DEPART	701	0	0
790	36	ASSIGN	701	0	0
800	37	ADVANCE	703	2	0
810	38	LEAVE	701	0	0
820	39	QUEUE	701	0	0
830	40	TRANSFER	701	0	0
850	BPANS	ADVANCE	701	0	0
860	42	QUEUE	701	0	0
870	FBACK	ASSEMBLE	1408	6	0
880	44	DEPART	701	0	0
890	45	DEPART	701	0	0
900	46	QUEUE	701	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
910	47	ENTER	701	0	0
920	48	DEPART	701	0	0
930	49	ASSIGN	701	0	0
940	50	ADVANCE	701	1	0
950	51	LEAVE	700	0	0
960	52	QUEUE	700	0	0
970	53	ENTER	700	0	0
980	54	DEPART	700	0	0
990	55	ASSIGN	700	0	0
1000	56	ADVANCE	704	3	0
1010	57	LEAVE	701	0	0
1020	58	QUEUE	701	0	0
1030	59	ENTER	701	0	0
1040	60	DEPART	701	0	0
1050	61	ASSIGN	701	0	0
1060	62	ADVANCE	705	4	0
1070	63	LEAVE	701	0	0
1080	64	QUEUE	701	4	0
1090	65	ENTER	697	0	0
1100	66	DEPART	697	0	0
1110	67	ASSIGN	697	0	0
1120	68	ADVANCE	700	3	0
1130	69	LEAVE	697	0	0
1140	70	QUEUE	731	70	0
1150	71	ENTER	661	0	0
1160	72	DEPART	661	0	0
1170	73	ASSIGN	661	0	0
1180	74	ADVANCE	669	8	0
1190	75	LEAVE	661	0	0
1200	76	QUEUE	662	0	0
1210	77	ENTER	662	0	0
1220	78	DEPART	662	0	0
1230	79	ASSIGN	662	0	0
1240	80	ADVANCE	667	4	0
1250	81	LEAVE	663	0	0
1260	82	QUEUE	663	0	0
1270	83	TRANSFER	663	0	0
1290	FLIES	ADVANCE	701	0	0
1300	85	QUEUE	702	1	0
1310	86	ENTER	701	0	0
1320	87	DEPART	701	0	0
1330	88	ASSIGN	701	0	0
1340	89	ADVANCE	702	1	0
1350	90	LEAVE	701	0	0
1360	91	QUEUE	744	80	0
1370	92	ENTER	664	0	0
1380	93	DEPART	664	0	0
1390	94	ASSIGN	664	0	0
1400	95	ADVANCE	669	5	0
1410	96	LEAVE	664	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
1420	97	QUEUE	664	4	0
1430	98	ENTER	660	0	0
1440	99	DEPART	660	0	0
1450	100	ASSIGN	660	0	0
1460	101	ADVANCE	663	5	0
1470	102	LEAVE	658	0	0
1480	103	QUEUE	658	0	0
1490	104	TRANSFER	658	0	0
1510	FPOCS	ADVANCE	701	0	0
1520	106	QUEUE	701	0	0
1530	107	ENTER	701	0	0
1540	108	DEPART	701	0	0
1550	109	ASSIGN	701	0	0
1560	110	ADVANCE	704	4	0
1570	111	LEAVE	700	0	0
1580	112	QUEUE	700	0	0
1590	113	TRANSFER	700	0	0
1610	FPANS	ADVANCE	701	0	0
1620	115	QUEUE	701	0	0
1630	FPANL	ASSEMBLE	2112	96	0
1640	117	DEPART	658	0	0
1650	118	DEPART	658	0	0
1660	119	DEPART	658	0	0
1670	120	QUEUE	658	0	0
1680	121	ENTER	658	0	0
1690	122	DEPART	658	0	0
1700	123	ASSIGN	658	0	0
1710	124	ADVANCE	659	1	0
1720	125	LEAVE	658	0	0
1730	126	QUEUE	660	2	0
1740	127	ENTER	658	0	0
1750	128	DEPART	658	0	0
1760	129	ASSIGN	658	0	0
1770	130	ADVANCE	666	8	0
1780	131	LEAVE	658	0	0
1790	132	QUEUE	659	0	0
1800	133	ENTER	659	0	0
1810	134	DEPART	659	0	0
1820	135	ASSIGN	659	0	0
1830	136	ADVANCE	666	7	0
1840	137	LEAVE	659	0	0
1850	138	QUEUE	659	0	0
1860	139	ENTER	659	0	0
1870	140	DEPART	659	0	0
1880	141	ASSIGN	659	0	0
1890	142	ADVANCE	664	5	0
1900	143	LEAVE	659	0	0
1910	144	QUEUE	659	0	0
1920	145	ENTER	659	0	0
1930	146	DEPART	659	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
1940	147	ASSIGN	659	0	0
1950	148	ADVANCE	665	6	0
1960	149	LEAVE	659	0	0
1970	150	QUEUE	659	0	0
1980	151	TRANSFER	659	0	0
2000	BLUPS	ADVANCE	701	0	0
2010	153	QUEUE	701	0	0
2020	154	ENTER	701	0	0
2030	155	DEPART	701	0	0
2040	156	ASSIGN	701	0	0
2050	157	ADVANCE	703	2	0
2060	158	LEAVE	701	0	0
2070	159	QUEUE	701	0	0
2080	FEVRY	ASSEMBLE	2807	125	0
2090	161	DEPART	659	0	0
2100	162	DEPART	659	0	0
2110	163	DEPART	659	0	0
2120	164	DEPART	659	0	0
2130	165	QUEUE	659	0	0
2140	166	ENTER	659	0	0
2150	167	DEPART	659	0	0
2160	168	ASSIGN	659	0	0
2170	169	ADVANCE	660	1	0
2180	170	LEAVE	659	0	0
2190	171	QUEUE	659	0	0
2200	172	ENTER	659	0	0
2210	173	DEPART	659	0	0
2220	174	ASSIGN	659	0	0
2230	175	ADVANCE	660	2	0
2240	176	LEAVE	658	0	0
2250	177	QUEUE	658	0	0
2260	178	ENTER	658	0	0
2270	179	DEPART	658	0	0
2280	180	ASSIGN	658	0	0
2290	181	ADVANCE	669	11	0
2300	182	LEAVE	658	0	0
2320	183	QUEUE	658	0	0
2330	184	ENTER	658	0	0
2340	185	DEPART	658	0	0
2350	186	ASSIGN	658	0	0
2360	187	ADVANCE	670	11	0
2370	188	LEAVE	659	0	0
2380	189	QUEUE	659	0	0
2390	190	ENTER	659	0	0
2400	191	DEPART	659	0	0
2410	192	ASSIGN	659	0	0
2420	193	ADVANCE	666	8	0
2430	194	LEAVE	658	0	0
2440	195	QUEUE	658	1	0
2450	196	ENTER	657	0	0



LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
2460	197	DEPART	657	0	0
2470	198	ASSIGN	657	0	0
2480	199	ADVANCE	664	8	0
2490	200	LEAVE	656	0	0
2500	201	QUEUE	656	0	0
2510	202	ENTER	656	0	0
2520	203	DEPART	656	0	0
2530	204	ASSIGN	656	0	0
2540	205	ADVANCE	659	3	0
2550	206	LEAVE	656	0	0
2560	207	QUEUE	658	1	0
2570	208	ENTER	657	0	0
2580	209	DEPART	657	0	0
2590	210	ASSIGN	657	0	0
2600	211	ADVANCE	667	10	0
2610	212	LEAVE	657	0	0
2620	213	QUEUE	657	2	0
2630	214	ENTER	655	0	0
2640	215	DEPART	655	0	0
2650	216	ASSIGN	655	0	0
2660	217	ADVANCE	660	5	0
2670	218	LEAVE	655	0	0
2680	219	QUEUE	655	0	0
2690	220	ENTER	655	0	0
2700	221	DEPART	655	0	0
2710	222	ASSIGN	655	0	0
2720	223	ADVANCE	665	10	0
2730	224	LEAVE	655	0	0
2740	225	QUEUE	655	1	0
2750	226	ENTER	654	0	0
2760	227	DEPART	654	0	0
2770	228	ASSIGN	654	0	0
2780	229	ADVANCE	658	5	0
2790	230	LEAVE	653	0	0
2800	231	QUEUE	653	1	0
2810	232	ENTER	652	0	0
2820	233	DEPART	652	0	0
2830	234	ASSIGN	652	0	0
2840	235	ADVANCE	670	19	0
2850	236	LEAVE	651	0	0
2855	237	TABULATE	651	0	0
2860	238	TERMINATE	651	0	0
2880	TIMER	GENERATE	10	0	0
2890	240	TERMINATE	10	0	0

QUEUE	MAX	CONT.	ENTRIES	ENTRIES(0)	AVE.CONT.	AVE.TIME	AVE.(-0)	RETRY
QCUTR	1	0	701	675	0.01	8.25	222.11	0
QCODE	2	0	700	662	0.01	10.15	187.00	0
QBND5	127	125	784	0	105.73	64730.97	64730.97	0

QUEUE	MAX	CONT.	ENTRIES	ENTRIES(0)	AVE.CONT.	AVE.TIME	AVE.(-0)	RETRY
QBHEM	3	0	701	390	0.29	201.00	453.05	0
QBHOL	3	0	701	322	0.34	235.60	435.77	0
QBPOC	1	0	701	701	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBPAN	9	6	707	0	5.98	4062.28	4062.28	0
QMBKS	1	0	701	454	0.11	76.67	217.60	0
QDART	3	0	700	377	0.26	176.33	382.13	0
QTOPS	3	0	701	470	0.14	97.38	295.50	0
QBLAB	5	4	701	124	0.98	668.15	811.74	0
QABP	73	70	731	0	54.20	35588.85	35588.85	0
QSEAM	5	0	662	255	0.72	524.75	853.52	0
QMB	26	22	681	659	19.94	14050.46	434925.50	0
QLFLY	4	1	702	75	1.02	696.49	779.80	0
QRFLY	82	80	744	0	62.77	40494.86	40494.86	0
QJOIN	6	4	664	108	1.95	1406.22	1679.37	0
QFLYS	2	0	658	658	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFHEM	4	0	701	394	0.28	189.10	431.79	0
QFPOC	93	92	750	658	72.73	46545.93	379450.54	0
QFPAN	97	96	754	0	76.61	48768.61	48768.61	0
QMFTS	3	0	658	303	0.28	200.60	371.81	0
QAFP	8	2	660	131	1.81	1314.20	1639.64	0
QAFLY	4	0	659	298	0.60	435.03	794.14	0
QTFLY	4	0	659	347	0.42	305.17	644.53	0
QFINF	4	0	659	223	0.70	507.09	766.45	0
QMF	1	0	659	659	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QLUPS	3	0	701	527	0.12	82.58	332.63	0
QBL	125	123	782	659	104.27	63995.50	406865.72	0
QMFBS	3	0	659	311	0.27	198.01	374.97	0
QUPS	2	0	659	336	0.20	146.91	299.74	0
QSIDE	4	0	658	316	0.47	346.20	666.08	0
QINS	4	0	658	444	0.30	221.65	681.51	0
QAWB	3	0	659	380	0.40	294.61	695.37	0
QBEND	4	1	658	415	0.32	235.73	633.02	0
QBUTN	3	0	656	460	0.18	134.21	449.13	0
QABL	6	1	658	175	1.37	997.12	1353.00	0
QTACK	7	2	657	137	1.35	982.70	1241.60	0
QFOLD	4	0	655	430	0.25	185.64	540.40	0
QPRES	4	1	655	350	0.41	302.62	649.80	0
QSPEC	6	1	653	463	0.30	221.18	760.16	0

STORAGE	CAP.	REMAIN.	MIN.	MAX.	ENTRIES	AVL.	AVE.C.	UTIL.	RETRY	DELAY
ABL	10	0	6	10	667	1	9.75	0.975	0	1
ABP	8	0	7	8	669	1	8.00	1.000	0	70
AFLY	7	0	3	7	666	1	6.58	0.941	0	0
AFP	8	0	5	8	666	1	7.86	0.983	0	2
AWB	8	0	2	8	666	1	7.17	0.897	0	0
BEND	8	0	3	8	664	1	7.22	0.903	0	1
BHEM	4	0	1	4	705	1	3.60	0.900	0	0
BHOL	2	0	0	2	703	1	1.75	0.873	0	0
BLAB	3	0	0	3	700	1	2.91	0.970	0	4

STORAGE	CAP.	REMAIN.	MIN.	MAX.	ENTRIES	AVL.	AVE.C.	UTIL.	RETRY	DELAY
BUTN	3	0	0	3	659	1	2.17	0.722	0	0
CODER	5	1	1	5	705	1	3.73	0.746	0	0
CUTTR	4	1	1	4	703	1	3.01	0.753	0	0
DARTS	4	1	1	4	704	1	3.66	0.916	0	0
FHEM	4	0	1	4	704	1	3.60	0.901	0	0
FINF	6	0	2	6	665	1	5.71	0.951	0	0
FOLD	11	1	6	11	665	1	10.16	0.924	0	0
INS	12	1	6	12	670	1	11.02	0.919	0	0
JOINT	5	0	2	5	663	1	4.91	0.983	0	4
LFLY	1	0	0	1	702	1	0.96	0.964	0	1
LUPS	2	0	0	2	703	1	1.35	0.674	0	0
MBKS	1	0	0	1	701	1	0.70	0.703	0	0
MFTS	1	0	0	1	659	1	0.66	0.661	0	0
MFBS	1	0	0	1	660	1	0.65	0.655	0	0
PRES	5	0	1	5	658	1	4.46	0.892	0	1
RFLY	5	0	4	5	669	1	5.00	1.000	0	80
SEAM	5	1	1	5	667	1	4.68	0.936	0	0
SIDE	11	0	6	11	669	1	10.49	0.954	0	0
SPRED	3	1	1	3	703	1	2.25	0.749	0	0
SPEC	19	0	12	19	670	1	17.85	0.939	0	1
TACK	5	0	2	5	660	1	4.84	0.968	0	2
TFLY	5	0	1	5	664	1	4.51	0.903	0	0
TOPS	4	0	1	4	705	1	3.45	0.862	0	0
UPS	2	0	0	2	660	1	1.65	0.823	0	0

TABLE	MEAN	STD.DEV.	RETRY	RANGE	FREQUENCY	CUM. %
JIT	142477.13	10211.37	0	810 -	651	100.00

XACT_GROUP	GROUP_SIZE	RETRY
POSITION	0	0

## **Appendix E**

**Sample Output from GPSS Model of a Hi-Tech Trouser Manufacturing  
Plant (Ideal Case of Perfect Balancing and No Stochasticism)**

START_TIME	END_TIME	BLOCKS	FACILITIES	STORAGES	FREE_MEMORY
480005	1440000	240	0	33	167504

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
430	1	GENERATE	1333	0	0
440	2	ENTER	1333	0	0
450	3	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
460	4	ADVANCE	1335	2	0
470	5	LEAVE	1333	0	0
480	6	QUEUE	1333	0	0
490	7	ENTER	1333	0	0
500	8	DEPART	1333	0	0
510	9	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
520	10	ADVANCE	1336	3	0
530	11	LEAVE	1333	0	0
540	12	QUEUE	1333	0	0
550	13	ENTER	1333	0	0
560	14	DEPART	1333	0	0
570	15	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
580	16	ADVANCE	1336	3	0
590	17	LEAVE	1333	0	0
600	18	SPLIT	1333	0	0
610	19	SPLIT	1333	0	0
620	20	SPLIT	1333	0	0
630	21	SPLIT	1333	0	0
640	22	SPLIT	1333	0	0
650	23	SPLIT	1333	0	0
660	24	QUEUE	1333	0	0
670	25	TRANSFER	1333	0	0
690	BPOCS	ADVANCE	1333	0	0
700	27	QUEUE	1333	0	0
710	28	ENTER	1333	0	0
720	29	DEPART	1333	0	0
730	30	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
740	31	ADVANCE	1337	4	0
750	32	LEAVE	1333	0	0
760	33	QUEUE	1333	0	0
770	34	ENTER	1333	0	0
780	35	DEPART	1333	0	0
790	36	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
800	37	ADVANCE	1335	1	0
810	38	LEAVE	1334	0	0
820	39	QUEUE	1334	0	0
830	40	TRANSFER	1334	0	0
850	BPANS	ADVANCE	1333	0	0
860	42	QUEUE	1333	0	0
870	FBACK	ASSEMBLE	2673	5	0
880	44	DEPART	1334	0	0
890	45	DEPART	1334	0	0
900	46	QUEUE	1334	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETF
910	47	ENTER	1334	0	C
920	48	DEPART	1334	0	C
930	49	ASSIGN	1334	0	C
940	50	ADVANCE	1334	1	C
950	51	LEAVE	1333	0	C
960	52	QUEUE	1333	0	C
970	53	ENTER	1333	0	0
980	54	DEPART	1333	0	0
990	55	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1000	56	ADVANCE	1337	3	0
1010	57	LEAVE	1334	0	C
1020	58	QUEUE	1334	0	0
1030	59	ENTER	1334	0	C
1040	60	DEPART	1334	0	0
1050	61	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
1060	62	ADVANCE	1337	4	0
1070	63	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1080	64	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1090	65	ENTER	1333	0	0
1100	66	DEPART	1333	0	0
1110	67	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1120	68	ADVANCE	1336	2	0
1130	69	LEAVE	1334	0	0
1140	70	QUEUE	1334	0	0
1150	71	ENTER	1334	0	0
1160	72	DEPART	1334	0	0
1170	73	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
1180	74	ADVANCE	1342	8	0
1190	75	LEAVE	1334	0	0
1200	76	QUEUE	1334	0	0
1210	77	ENTER	1334	0	C
1220	78	DEPART	1334	0	C
1230	79	ASSIGN	1334	0	C
1240	80	ADVANCE	1338	5	C
1250	81	LEAVE	1333	0	C
1260	82	QUEUE	1333	0	C
1270	83	TRANSFER	1333	0	C
1290	FLIES	ADVANCE	1333	0	0
1300	85	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1310	86	ENTER	1333	0	0
1320	87	DEPART	1333	0	0
1330	88	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1340	89	ADVANCE	1334	1	0
1350	90	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1360	91	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1370	92	ENTER	1333	0	0
1380	93	DEPART	1333	0	0
1390	94	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1400	95	ADVANCE	1338	5	0
1410	96	LEAVE	1333	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
1420	97	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1430	98	ENTER	1333	0	0
1440	99	DEPART	1333	0	0
1450	100	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1460	101	ADVANCE	1338	5	0
1470	102	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1480	103	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1490	104	TRANSFER	1333	0	0
1510	FPOCS	ADVANCE	1333	0	0
1520	106	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1530	107	ENTER	1333	0	0
1540	108	DEPART	1333	0	0
1550	109	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1560	110	ADVANCE	1337	3	0
1570	111	LEAVE	1334	0	0
1580	112	QUEUE	1334	0	0
1590	113	TRANSFER	1334	0	0
1610	FPANS	ADVANCE	1333	0	0
1620	115	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1630	FPANL	ASSEMBLE	4011	11	0
1640	117	DEPART	1333	0	0
1650	118	DEPART	1333	0	0
1660	119	DEPART	1333	0	0
1670	120	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1680	121	ENTER	1333	0	0
1690	122	DEPART	1333	0	0
1700	123	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1710	124	ADVANCE	1334	1	0
1720	125	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1730	126	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1740	127	ENTER	1333	0	0
1750	128	DEPART	1333	0	0
1760	129	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1770	130	ADVANCE	1341	8	0
1780	131	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1790	132	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1800	133	ENTER	1333	0	0
1810	134	DEPART	1333	0	0
1820	135	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1830	136	ADVANCE	1340	6	0
1840	137	LEAVE	1334	0	0
1850	138	QUEUE	1334	0	0
1860	139	ENTER	1334	0	0
1870	140	DEPART	1334	0	0
1880	141	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
1890	142	ADVANCE	1338	5	0
1900	143	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1910	144	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1920	145	ENTER	1333	0	0
1930	146	DEPART	1333	0	0

LINE	LOC	BLOCK TYPE	ENTRY COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
1940	147	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
1950	148	ADVANCE	1339	6	0
1960	149	LEAVE	1333	0	0
1970	150	QUEUE	1333	0	0
1980	151	TRANSFER	1333	0	0
2000	BLUPS	ADVANCE	1333	0	0
2010	153	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2020	154	ENTER	1333	0	0
2030	155	DEPART	1333	0	0
2040	156	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2050	157	ADVANCE	1335	1	0
2060	158	LEAVE	1334	0	0
2070	159	QUEUE	1334	0	0
2080	FEVRY	ASSEMBLE	5370	37	0
2090	161	DEPART	1333	0	0
2100	162	DEPART	1333	0	0
2110	163	DEPART	1333	0	0
2120	164	DEPART	1333	0	0
2130	165	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2140	166	ENTER	1333	0	0
2150	167	DEPART	1333	0	0
2160	168	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2170	169	ADVANCE	1334	0	0
2180	170	LEAVE	1334	0	0
2190	171	QUEUE	1334	0	0
2200	172	ENTER	1334	0	0
2210	173	DEPART	1334	0	0
2220	174	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
2230	175	ADVANCE	1335	2	0
2240	176	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2250	177	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2260	178	ENTER	1333	0	0
2270	179	DEPART	1333	0	0
2280	180	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2290	181	ADVANCE	1344	11	0
2300	182	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2320	183	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2330	184	ENTER	1333	0	0
2340	185	DEPART	1333	0	0
2350	186	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2360	187	ADVANCE	1344	11	0
2370	188	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2380	189	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2390	190	ENTER	1333	0	0
2400	191	DEPART	1333	0	0
2410	192	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2420	193	ADVANCE	1341	7	0
2430	194	LEAVE	1334	0	0
2440	195	QUEUE	1334	0	0
2450	196	ENTER	1334	0	0



LINE	LOC	BLOCK_TYPE	ENTRY_COUNT	CURRENT_COUNT	RETRY
2460	197	DEPART	1334	0	0
2470	198	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
2480	199	ADVANCE	1341	7	0
2490	200	LEAVE	1334	0	0
2500	201	QUEUE	1334	0	0
2510	202	ENTER	1334	0	0
2520	203	DEPART	1334	0	0
2530	204	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
2540	205	ADVANCE	1336	3	0
2550	206	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2560	207	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2570	208	ENTER	1333	0	0
2580	209	DEPART	1333	0	0
2590	210	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2600	211	ADVANCE	1343	10	0
2610	212	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2620	213	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2630	214	ENTER	1333	0	0
2640	215	DEPART	1333	0	0
2650	216	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2660	217	ADVANCE	1338	4	0
2670	218	LEAVE	1334	0	0
2680	219	QUEUE	1334	0	0
2690	220	ENTER	1334	0	0
2700	221	DEPART	1334	0	0
2710	222	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
2720	223	ADVANCE	1344	11	0
2730	224	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2740	225	QUEUE	1333	0	0
2750	226	ENTER	1333	0	0
2760	227	DEPART	1333	0	0
2770	228	ASSIGN	1333	0	0
2780	229	ADVANCE	1338	4	0
2790	230	LEAVE	1334	0	0
2800	231	QUEUE	1334	0	0
2810	232	ENTER	1334	0	0
2820	233	DEPART	1334	0	0
2830	234	ASSIGN	1334	0	0
2840	235	ADVANCE	1352	19	0
2850	236	LEAVE	1333	0	0
2855	237	TABULATE	1333	0	0
2860	238	TERMINATE	1333	0	0
2880	TIMER	GENERATE	20	0	0
2890	240	TERMINATE	20	0	0

QUEUE	MAX	CONT.	ENTRIES	ENTRIES(0)	AVE.CONT.	AVE.TIME	AVE.(-0)	RETF
QCUTR	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	(
QCODE	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	(
QBND5	37	37	1370	0	36.70	25716.71	25716.71	(

QUEUE	MAX	CONT.	ENTRIES	ENTRIES(0)	AVE.CONT.	AVE.TIME	AVE.(-0)	RETR
QBHEM	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBHOL	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBPOC	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBPAN	6	5	1339	0	5.10	3656.42	3656.42	0
QMBKS	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QDART	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QTOPS	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBLAB	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QABP	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSEAM	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QMB	9	9	1342	1333	8.70	6223.57	928003.00	0
QLFLY	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QRFLY	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QJOIN	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFLYS	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFHEM	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFPOC	8	8	1341	1333	7.52	5380.95	901982.50	0
QFPAN	11	11	1344	0	10.92	7797.59	7797.59	0
QMFTS	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QAFP	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QAFly	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QTFLY	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFINF	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QMF	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QLUPS	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBL	36	36	1369	1333	35.42	24835.52	944439.67	0
QMFBS	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QUPS	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSIDE	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QINS	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QAWB	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBEND	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QBUTN	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QABL	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QTACK	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QFOLD	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QPRES	1	0	1333	1333	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
QSPEC	1	0	1334	1334	0.00	0.00	0.00	0

STORAGE	CAP.	REMAIN.	MIN.	MAX.	ENTRIES	AVL.	AVE.C.	UTIL.	RETRY	DELA
ABL	10	0	9	10	1343	1	9.93	0.993	0	0
ABP	8	0	7	8	1342	1	8.00	1.000	0	0
AFLY	7	1	6	7	1340	1	6.73	0.962	0	0
AFP	8	0	7	8	1341	1	8.00	1.000	0	0
AWB	8	1	7	8	1341	1	7.28	0.910	0	0
BEND	8	1	7	8	1341	1	7.23	0.904	0	0
BHEM	4	0	3	4	1337	1	3.43	0.858	0	0
BHOL	2	1	1	2	1335	1	1.67	0.833	0	0
BLAB	3	1	2	3	1336	1	2.78	0.928	0	0

STORAGE	CAP.	REMAIN.	MIN.	MAX.	ENTRIES	AVL.	AVE.C.	UTIL.	RETRY	DEL
BUTN	3	0	2	3	1336	1	2.18	0.728	0	(
CODER	5	2	3	4	1336	1	3.57	0.714	0	(
CUTTR	4	1	2	3	1336	1	2.86	0.714	0	(
DARTS	4	1	3	4	1337	1	3.47	0.867	0	(
FHEM	4	1	3	4	1337	1	3.40	0.850	0	(
FINF	6	0	5	6	1339	1	5.82	0.969	0	(
FOLD	11	0	10	11	1344	1	10.32	0.938	0	(
INS	12	1	11	12	1344	1	11.23	0.936	0	(
JOINT	5	0	4	5	1338	1	5.00	1.000	0	(
LFLY	1	0	0	1	1334	1	0.92	0.917	0	(
LUPS	2	1	1	2	1335	1	1.28	0.642	0	(
MBKS	1	0	0	1	1334	1	0.67	0.667	0	(
MFTS	1	0	0	1	1334	1	0.67	0.667	0	(
MFBS	1	1	0	1	1334	1	0.67	0.667	0	(
PRES	5	1	4	5	1338	1	4.57	0.913	0	(
RFLY	5	0	4	5	1338	1	5.00	1.000	0	(
SEAM	5	0	4	5	1338	1	4.70	0.940	0	(
SIDE	11	0	10	11	1344	1	10.58	0.962	0	(
SPRED	3	1	2	3	1335	1	2.14	0.714	0	(
SPEC	19	0	18	19	1352	1	18.28	0.962	0	(
TACK	5	1	4	5	1338	1	4.92	0.983	0	(
TFLY	5	0	4	5	1338	1	4.57	0.913	0	(
TOPS	4	0	3	4	1337	1	3.28	0.821	0	(
UPS	2	0	1	2	1335	1	1.67	0.833	0	(

TABLE	MEAN	STD.DEV.	RETRY	RANGE	FREQUENCY	CUM.%
JIT	96579.00	0.00	0	810 -	1333	100.00

XACT_GROUP	GROUP_SIZE	RETRY
POSITION	0	0